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Abstract

Although some organizations have formally introduced flexible work arrangements (FWAs) to enhance work–family enrichment, research indicates that informal organizational characteristics, such as perceived organizational support (POS) to utilize FWAs, may be more effective in achieving positive employee work and non-work outcomes. Prior studies have established significant relationships between POS and work–family conflict. However, scarce research has focused on the underlying self-efficacy mechanisms linking POS to employee work and non-work outcomes. Drawing on social cognitive theory and the job demand-control-support model, this paper addresses this knowledge gap by examining how POS facilitates work–family enrichment through the mediating mechanism of self-efficacy to regulate work and life.

To test the hypothesized mediation model, we collected self-report time-lagged data from 253 public-sector and private-sector employees in Australia. Structural equation modeling results revealed that POS positively predicted self-efficacy to regulate work and life, in turn leading to work-to-family enrichment (development, affect, capital) and family-to-work enrichment (development, affect, efficiency). Evidence of these relationships across two time points was demonstrated, emphasizing the synergistic combination of POS and dynamic processes of self-efficacy to regulate work and life in facilitating work–family enrichment.
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Modern workplaces reflect major changes in demographic trends (e.g., ageing workforce), social contexts (e.g., converging gender roles), and economic forces (e.g., 24/7 work culture), which have given rise to policies and practices focused on enhancing employees’ work–family enrichment (Brough & O’Driscoll, 2010; Haines et al., 2020; Timms et al., 2020). Defined as the “extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role” (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006, p. 73), work–family enrichment is bi-directional such that work-to-family enrichment (WFE) occurs when resources gained in the work domain facilitate family role fulfilment and enhance family life, while family-to-work enrichment (FWE) occurs when resources gained in the family domain enhance work performance and functioning. The extant work/non-work literature has previously focused on work–family conflict, with markedly fewer empirical studies examining the antecedents of work–family enrichment (Brough et al., 2014; Siu et al., 2015; Tang et al., 2014). Prior studies also tended to focus on WFE, often excluding FWE (Brough et al., 2020). This lack of knowledge hinders attempts to produce practical recommendations that foster employees’ WFE and FWE, which is unfortunate because employees who experience both WFE and FWE generally have higher levels of work engagement, satisfaction, and performance, less burnout, as well as increased organizational citizenship behavior (Kalliath et al., 2020; Siu & Ng, 2021; Zhang et al., 2018).

More recently, the COVID-19 pandemic has also prompted a sweeping transition to remote working among office-based workers (Kramer & Kramer, 2020), which has also given them access to job autonomy and flexible work arrangements (FWAs) such as flexible start and finish times (Wang et al., 2020). However, despite this provision of FWAs before and during the pandemic, their presence in employees’ work environments guarantees neither
their use, nor the enhancement of work/non-work balance (Kelly et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2020). Further, prior studies (e.g., Conradie & de Klerk, 2019; Dikkers et al., 2004; Wayne et al., 2006) have identified no significant associations between the provision and use of FWAs, and levels of work–family conflict, enrichment, and balance. Dikkers et al. (2007) observed that the presence of family-friendly policies and FWAs are a “necessary but insufficient condition” (p. 156) for employees to use them, and added that informal support and encouragement are more crucial than the provision of FWAs and policies in assisting employees to achieve positive work outcomes. Nevertheless, how employees’ work and non-work experiences are influenced by such informal support and encouragement (e.g., through perceived organizational support) is an important question that requires further attention.

Previous research (e.g., Allen, 2001; Thompson et al., 2006; Wayne et al., 2006) reported that employees’ perceptions of organizational and supervisory support permitting access to FWAs are effective in inducing positive work attitudes and behaviors among employees. These findings are also supported by more recent studies (e.g., Beauregard, 2011; Chang et al., 2014; Foucreault et al., 2018) that have established significant relationships between perceived organizational support for employees to manage their work and non-work responsibilities, work–family conflict, and work–home segmentation preferences. Correspondingly, the current study uses Dikkers et al.’s (2004) perceived organizational support (POS) measure contextualized to FWAs—that is, participants assessed their perceptions of organization’s support for their utilization of FWAs. Similarly, self-efficacy is also considered a key element in the conflict and enrichment processes in the work/non-work interface (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012), but scarce research has identified the underlying self-efficacy mechanisms linking POS to employee work and non-work outcomes (Eby et al., 2005). The study thus examines a domain-specific self-efficacy (i.e., self-efficacy to regulate work and life) contextualized to the work/non-work interface (Chan et al., 2016).
as an explanatory mechanism between POS and work–family enrichment.

Drawing on Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory and Karasek and Theorell’s (1990) job demand-control-support (JDCS) model, we propose that when employees perceive their organizations being supportive of their work and non-work lives (i.e., POS; Dikkers et al., 2004), they develop beliefs in their own abilities to manage their work and non-work demands and responsibilities, leading to self-efficacy to regulate work and life (Kurtessis et al., 2015). Employees then draw on their self-efficacy to regulate work and life beliefs to gain autonomy and control over their work and non-work lives (Karasek & Theorell, 1990), enabling them to experience WFE and FWE as a result. By testing these relationships, we contribute to work/non-work research in three ways. First, we examine the mediating role of self-efficacy to regulate work and life, thereby broadening current explanations of how underlying psychosocial mechanisms link POS to work–family enrichment. Second, we supplement work/non-work research by identifying new ways of cultivating work–family enrichment, specifically through building self-efficacy to regulate work and life. Third, we contextualize organizational support and self-efficacy to the work/non-work context, where we assess employees’ perceptions of their organization’s support for their utilization of FWAs and self-efficacy to regulate work and life. In doing so, we investigate POS to utilize FWAs and self-efficacy to regulate work and life as precursors to work–family enrichment.1

**Theoretical Background and Development of Hypotheses**

**Social Cognitive Theory**

Since its inception, Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory has garnered strong support in predicting domain-specific attitudes and behaviors that are relevant to health, well-
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1 Apart from the established terms “work–family enrichment”, “work–family conflict”, and “self-efficacy to regulate work and life”, we will use “work and non-work” to include single employees, and other types of family structure and non-work (e.g., community or social) roles throughout this study (Brough et al., 2014).
being, and the work/non-work interface (Kuykendall et al., 2021). Based on the theory, personal, behavioral, and environmental factors operate as interacting determinants that affect each other reciprocally, and ultimately influence a person’s self-concept (Bandura, 1989). The bi-directional interactions between the personal, behavioral, and environmental factors imply that individuals are both products and producers of their environments (Wood & Bandura, 1989). The triadic reciprocal determinism model underpinning social cognitive theory showed a shift from traditional social learning theories by emphasizing the role that cognition plays in influencing people’s capability to self-regulate, construct reality, make sense of information, and perform expected behaviors (Bandura, 2006). A core component of social cognitive theory is self-efficacy, which refers to an individual’s belief in their own ability to execute behaviors necessary to produce specific performance attainments (Bandura, 1977a, 1986, 1997). Self-efficacy operates as a proximal determinant of human motivation, affect, and behavior through the exercise of personal agency (Bandura, 1989). The significance of self-efficacy has led many researchers to consider it a key personal resource that influences how individuals think, feel, and motivate themselves, and exercise influence over events that affect their lives (Chan et al., 2017; Xanthopoulou et al., 2007).

**Self-Efficacy to Regulate Work and Life**

Domain-specific self-efficacy refers to self-efficacy beliefs that are specific to a setting (e.g., social work; see Holden et al., 2002) or task (e.g., writing a scientific paper; see Forester et al., 2004). In contrast to general self-efficacy, domain-specific self-efficacy is more proximally related to the target task, behavior, or goal, and is thus a stronger predictor of domain-specific outcomes (Bandura, 1977b, 1997, 2012). Some noteworthy examples of domain-specific self-efficacy include managerial self-efficacy (Lu et al., 2005), occupational self-efficacy (Rigotti et al., 2008), and self-efficacy for work–family conflict management (Hennessy & Lent, 2008). These domain-specific self-efficacy scales were developed in
response to prior research (e.g., Burns & Christiansen, 2011; Rigotti et al., 2008), highlighting the advantages of domain-specific self-efficacy beliefs as more proximal predictors of behaviors than general self-efficacy, since domain-specific self-efficacy beliefs are at the same level of specificity as their domain-specific outcomes.

This study examines self-efficacy to regulate work and life as the linking mechanism between POS and WFE and FWE. Self-efficacy to regulate work and life is a domain-specific self-efficacy that refers to the belief in one’s own ability to achieve a balance between work and non-work responsibilities, and to persist and cope with challenges posed by work and non-work demands (Chan et al., 2016). Hence, self-efficacy to regulate work and life is not a homeostatic end state of “balance”, but a dynamic process of managing work and non-work roles. Self-efficacy to regulate work and life has been shown to influence a range of work-related and non-work-related attitudes and behaviors, including work–life balance, work engagement, job and family satisfaction, and family undermining (Chan et al., 2017, 2021). However, to date, only a handful of studies (e.g., Chan et al., 2017, 2021; Grether et al., 2018; Hennessy & Lent, 2008) have examined domain-specific self-efficacy contextualized to the work/non-work interface. Other examples of work/non-work self-efficacy include Hennessy and Lent’s (2008) self-efficacy for work–family conflict management measure, and Grether et al.’s (2018) work-family-compatibility self-efficacy measure. These scales address the lack of self-efficacy constructs that theorize and capture the specific complexities of the work/non-work interface (Hennessy & Lent, 2008). Extending self-efficacy to the work/non-work interface, it is possible that individuals with strong beliefs in their ability to manage work and non-work roles will experience less role-related stress, lower levels of work–family conflict, and more satisfaction in both their work and non-work domains (Chan et al., 2016).

Perceived Organizational Support and Work–Family Enrichment
Examining each of the six specific WFE and FWE dimensions (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) provides a deeper appreciation of how they relate specifically to POS and self-efficacy to regulate work and life, and how best to foster employees’ work–family enrichment. WFE- and FWE-development occur when skills, knowledge, values, or perspectives acquired from participation in one role are used to improve performance in the other role, leading to an enhancement of intellectual and personal development. WFE- and FWE-affect occurs when the positive moods, attitudes, or emotions acquired from participation in one role are used to benefit the second role. WFE-capital refers to economic, social, or health benefits that can be acquired from participation in the workplace and employed effectively to improve an individual’s performance as a family member. FWE-efficiency refers to benefits (e.g., better time management) gained from involvement in familial responsibilities, which in turn can be used to enhance an individual’s performance as an employee.

Evidence (e.g., Chang et al., 2014; Foucreault et al., 2018; Odle-Dusseau et al., 2012; Thompson et al., 2006) suggests that the intangible aspects of an organization such as informal support, as opposed to formal access to FWAs, have a greater impact on employees’ perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors. This echoes prior research (e.g., Allen, 2001; Beauregard, 2011; Brough & O’Driscoll, 2010; Thompson et al., 1999) which found that organizational support directed at assisting employees’ management of their work and non-work responsibilities is significantly related to employees’ positive work attitudes and behaviors, beyond the availability of FWAs. Organizations that value the non-work aspects of employees’ lives, accommodate their multiple needs, and respond to their work and non-work concerns (Dikkers et al., 2007; Timms et al., 2015) are also more likely to enable their employees to experience work–family enrichment (Gayathri & Karthikeyan, 2016). Further, perceiving that it is acceptable to
have a life outside of work helps to make work/non-work boundaries more flexible, thus facilitating enrichment from work to non-work domains and vice versa (Matthews et al., 2010). Social support from the work domain has also been associated with FWE in multiple studies (e.g., Siu et al., 2015). Therefore, the current study also examines the within-domain and cross-domain spillover effects of POS on WFE and FWE.

Mediating Role of Self-Efficacy to Regulate Work and Life

POS and self-efficacy to regulate work and life are important enablers of WFE and FWE. Firstly, POS—in the form of supporting and encouraging employees to attend to their non-work needs alongside their work-related responsibilities—constitutes social persuasion that strengthens employees’ beliefs in their own ability to manage their work and non-work demands and responsibilities (Bandura, 1994; Timms et al., 2020). Specifically, when employees feel supported and encouraged by their organizations to deal with their non-work needs or challenges while working (e.g., working remotely to care for a sick child or family member), they are more likely to mobilize greater efforts and sustain them to develop their skills and personal efficacy to manage their work and non-work demands and responsibilities, which increases their self-efficacy to regulate work and life (Chan et al., 2017).

In prior studies based on Karasek and Theorell’s (1990) JDCS model, social support (i.e., perception that one is cared for and supported by others) has also been found to moderate the negative impact of high strain (i.e., a combination of high job demands and low job control) on psychological well-being (Brough et al., 2018). Nevertheless, a review by Häusser and colleagues (2010) revealed that empirical studies examining the moderating effect of social support on the relationship between high strain and psychological well-being did not find the moderating effect to be significant, possibly because the significance of the moderating effect depends on the source of social support. Further, the multiplicative effects of job demands, job control and social support on psychological well-being received weak
support, while the additive effects of job demands, job control and social support on psychological well-being have been well established in more recent studies (e.g., Brough & Biggs, 2015; Häusser et al., 2010). Hence, social support (which typically encompasses organizational support) is more likely to be an antecedent of psychological well-being, rather than a moderator of the relationship between high strain and psychological well-being.

In line with the theoretical arguments of social cognitive theory and the empirical findings of the JDCS model, it is proposed that self-efficacy to regulate work and life will mediate the relationship between POS and work–family enrichment. POS, characterized by an overall support for employees’ private lives and accommodation of work and non-work needs (Timms et al., 2015), increases the possibility of employees experiencing successes in managing their work and non-work demands and responsibilities (Caesens & Stinglhamber, 2014). Such mastery experiences are the most effective in enhancing employees’ self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1997). Further, POS also influences employees’ physiological and emotional states in a positive way, such as by reducing perceptions of and reactions to stress (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). As employees’ self-efficacy to regulate work and life is enhanced, they are more competent and effective in engaging in and performing multiple work and non-work roles (Chan et al., 2017; Erdwins et al., 2001). The increased engagement and performance in their work and non-work roles will in turn lead to a positive gain spiral of emotions (e.g., through satisfaction), skills (e.g., through a job promotion), and development (e.g., through professional development opportunities), such that WFE (development, affect, capital) and FWE (development, affect, efficiency) build over time. Finally, the dual WFE (development, affect, capital) and FWE (development, affect, efficiency) processes may also result in within- and cross-domain positive spillover between the work and non-work domains (Hakanen et al., 2011). Taken together, we propose:
**Hypothesis 1.** Self-efficacy to regulate work and life will mediate the relationships between POS and (a) WFE-development, (b) WFE-affect, and (c) WFE-capital.

**Hypothesis 2.** Self-efficacy to regulate work and life will mediate the relationships between POS and (a) FWE-development, (b) FWE-affect, and (c) FWE-efficiency.

**Method**

**Participants and Procedure**

An online two-wave self-report survey was administered to a convenience sample of employees who worked in a variety of fields such as accounting and finance, administration, education, and governance in Australia. We first approached our contacts in the industry, who in turn assisted us to disseminate the online survey to employees across five organisations in the education, financial and banking services, and government sectors. To encourage participation and reduce non-response bias at both time 1 (T1) and time 2 (T2), our industry contacts sent out reminder e-mails to participants two and four weeks after the online surveys were sent out and one week before the survey closing dates. There was a 12-month lag between T1 and T2 to allow time for the mediation effects of self-efficacy to regulate work and life to be observed. POS was assessed at T1, and self-efficacy to regulate work and life, WFE, and FWE were measured at T2.

T1 and T2 data screening was conducted using SPSS (version 22.0). A matched sample of 254 cases (average response rate = 35%) was obtained across both T1 and T2. Completed surveys at T1 and T2 were matched on the demographic variables—gender, age, marital status, education level, tenure, number of hours worked per week, and number of dependent children. The missing completely at random (MCAR) test resulted in $\chi^2 = 811.75$ ($df = 814; p = .52$), which indicated that the 21 missing data points were indeed MCAR. Of the 254 cases, one case (0.4% of sample) was deleted using listwise deletion as there were multiple missing values, yielding a final sample size of 253 respondents. The missing data
points were then estimated using expectation-maximization (EM) imputation, which is a superior technique to manage missing data as it overcomes the limitations (e.g., underestimation of standard errors) of other techniques such as mean or regression substitution (Schafer & Olsen, 1998).

Of the 253 respondents, 40% were male \( (n = 102) \) and 60% were female \( (n = 151) \), and their ages ranged from 20.0 to 63.0 years, with an average age of 40.8 years \( (SD = 9.9 \) years). A majority \( (72\%, n = 181) \) of the respondents were married or cohabiting, 19% \( (n = 48) \) were single or never married, and the remaining 10% \( (n = 24) \) were divorced, separated, or widowed. The average tenure was 8.1 years \( (SD = 7.8 \) years), and approximately 77\% \( (n = 185) \) of the respondents had either a university or a postgraduate qualification. The respondents spent an average of 38.9 hours \( (SD = 9.3 \) hours) working per week. Slightly more than half \( (54\%, n = 137) \) of the respondents had no children, while 18\% \( (n = 46) \) had one child, and 28\% \( (n = 70) \) had between two and four children. Although the sample consisted of a higher number of women than men, this gender representation was observed to be prevalent across the sampled industries.

Measures

Unless otherwise specified, the research measures were each rated on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

**Perceived organizational support (T1).** The construct was measured with Dikkers et al.’s (2004) four-item organizational-support scale. A sample item is “In this organization, it is considered important that, beyond their work, employees have sufficient time left for their private life”. \( (\alpha = .89) \)

**Self-efficacy to regulate work and life (T2).** The construct was measured with Chan et al.’s (2016) five-item scale which assesses the confidence level of respondents in regulating their work and non-work domains based on the centrality of efficacy beliefs in
their lives. A sample item is “How confident are you in changing your lifestyle to achieve a good work–life balance?” Respondents indicated their answer to each item on a scale ranging from 0 (cannot do at all) to 100 (highly certain can do). (α = .95)

**WFE and FWE (T2).** Carlson et al.’s (2006) 18-item work–family enrichment scale was used to assess the six work–family enrichment subscales. Sample items are: My involvement in my work/family “helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me to be a better family member” (WFE-development); “puts me in a good mood and this helps me to be a better family member” (WFE-affect); “helps me feel personally fulfilled and this helps me to be a better family member” (WFE-capital); “helps me gain knowledge and this helps me to be a better worker” (FWE-development); “puts me in a good mood and this helps me to be a better worker” (FWE-affect); “requires me to avoid wasting time at work and this helps me to be a better worker” (FWE-efficiency). (WFE-development α = .92; WFE-affect α = .95; WFE-capital α = .94; FWE-development α = .91; FWE-affect α = .96; FWE-efficiency α = .94)

**Control variables.** Informed by previous work/non-work studies (e.g., Beauregard, 2011; Wayne et al., 2006), we controlled for variables that influence work–life experiences such as gender (coded as 0 = male, 1 = female), marital status (0 = single or not married, 1 = divorced or separated, and 2 = married or cohabiting), number of hours worked per week, and number of dependent children. We also controlled for WFE (α = .93) and FWE (α = .88) at T1. Previous studies (e.g., McNall et al., 2010; Wayne et al., 2007) have also found significant relationships between both gender and longer work hours with work–family enrichment, due to the divergent roles and expectations for men and women. Hence, we expected that both gender and number of hours worked per week would be significantly associated with some of the focal research variables (see Table 1).

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

Preliminary Analyses

Based on Anderson and Gerbing’s (1988) two-step procedure, we first conducted confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) to assess the discriminant validity of the variables in our hypothesized model using SPSS AMOS (version 22.0). Following Cortina et al.’s (2017) guidelines for integrity and transparency in CFA analyses, we confirm that the CFA models and structural equation modeling (SEM) models in our study did not include any measurement error covariances or modification indices. The hypothesized eight-factor model ($\chi^2 (296) = 430.39, p < .001, CFI = .98, TLI = .98, RMSEA = .04, SRMR = .03$) fits the data well, suggesting that the eight self-report scales (i.e., POS, self-efficacy to regulate work and life, WFE-development, WFE-affect, WFE-capital, FWE-development, FWE-affect, and FWE-efficiency) were empirically distinct. We also tested alternative models: (1) a four-factor model with WFE-development, WFE-affect, and WFE-capital loading onto a single WFE construct, and FWE-development, FWE-affect, and FWE-efficiency loading onto a single FWE construct ($\chi^2 (318) = 2,295.19, p < .001, CFI = .70, TLI = .67, RMSEA = .16, SRMR = .13$); and (2) a one-factor model where all the study variables loaded onto a single factor ($\chi^2 (324) = 4,758.86, p < .001, CFI = .33, TLI = .27, RMSEA = .23, SRMR = .19$). Both alternative models showed much poorer fit than the hypothesized model, hence the hypothesized eight-factor model was the best fitting model. The one-factor model also serves as a common latent factor test that detects the presence of common method variance (CMV) (Podsakoff et al., 2012). The result of the test revealed that the average variance extracted from the items by the common latent factor was 17.0%, which is below the median of 25% reported in prior studies (Williams et al., 1989). Hence, our results are not likely to have been
contaminated by CMV. Since all variance inflation factors (VIFs) for the study variables were under 2.5, multi-collinearity was also not an issue (Allison, 2001).

**Hypothesis Testing**

The means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations among the research variables are presented in Table 1. The correlational analyses provided initial support for all the research hypotheses except Hypotheses 2b and 2c. While full mediation appeared to be supported, the direct relationships between POS (T1) and FWE-affect (T2) \( (r = .04, p = .54) \) and POS (T1) and FWE-efficiency (T2) \( (r = .12, p = .05) \) were not significant. Nevertheless, it is still possible for self-efficacy to regulate work and life to mediate the relationship, as mediation is the sum of all direct and indirect effects (Hayes, 2009).

The study hypotheses were tested using SEM with SPSS AMOS (version 22.0). Specifically, estimates of indirect effects and bias-corrected bootstrapped estimates of the standard errors and confidence intervals of the indirect effects \( (k = 5,000) \) were computed. We estimated the hypothesized the full mediation model, which showed moderate fit \( (\chi^2(317) = 907.04, p < .001, CFI = .91, TLI = .90, RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .18) \). Path coefficients, standard errors, and exact \( p \)-values are presented in Figure 1. We observed that self-efficacy to regulate work and life mediated the relationships between POS and (a) WFE-development \( (indirect \text{ effect } = .10, SE = .04, 95\% CI [.05, .18]) \), (b) WFE-affect \( (indirect \text{ effect } = .13, SE = .04, 95\% CI [.07, .22]) \), and (c) WFE-capital \( (indirect \text{ effect } = .12, SE = .04, 95\% CI [.05, .20]) \), thus supporting Hypotheses 1(a), 1(b), and 1(c). Self-efficacy to regulate work and life also mediated the relationships between POS and (a) FWE-development \( (indirect \text{ effect } = .10, SE = .03, 95\% CI [.05, .17]) \), (b) FWE-affect \( (indirect \text{ effect } = .09, SE = .03, 95\% CI [.04, .15]) \), and (c) FWE-efficiency \( (indirect \text{ effect } = .10, SE = .03, 95\% CI [.05, .17]) \), thus supporting Hypotheses 2(a), 2(b), and 2(c).
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Although we observed full support for the hypothesized mediation model, we examined an alternative structural equation model to probe the possibility of mediation through non-hypothesized paths. Specifically, we included direct paths linking POS to all dimensions of WFE and FWE, yielding a partial mediation model (see Figure 2). The partial mediation model showed slightly better fit ($\chi^2(311) = 869.88, p < .001, CFI = .92, TLI = .91, RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .17$) than the hypothesized full mediation model. Path coefficients, standard errors, and exact $p$-values are presented in Figure 2. We observed that the direct effects of POS on WFE-development ($\beta = .23, p = .001$), WFE-affect ($\beta = .30, p < .001$), and WFE-capital ($\beta = .23, p < .001$) remained significant even after direct paths were included between POS and all dimensions of work–family enrichment, indicating that the hypothesized mediation model is in fact a partial mediation model.

Discussion

We drew on social cognitive theory and the JDCS model to examine the underlying mechanisms leading from POS to self-efficacy to regulate work and life, and subsequently, work–family enrichment. Our results provide robust support for the hypothesized mediation effects of self-efficacy to regulate work and life on the relationships between POS and each of the WFE and FWE dimensions across two time points. Specifically, self-efficacy to regulate work and life fully mediated the relationships between POS and FWE-development, FWE-affect, and FWE-efficiency. Self-efficacy to regulate work and life also partially mediated the relationships between POS and WFE-development, WFE-affect, and WFE-capital. Through examining these relationships, our research makes three theoretical contributions to the literature on work/non-work research discussed in the next section.
Theoretical Implications

First, our study broadened current explanations of how underlying psychosocial mechanisms link POS to work–family enrichment. Drawing on social cognitive theory which underpins self-efficacy to regulate work and life, our study deviated from a resource-based perspective (e.g., conservation of resources theory and work–home resources model) which suggests that POS influences WFE and FWE through an accumulation of resources within the work domain and subsequent spillover of resources to the family domain (and vice versa) (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012), as well as organizational support theory which suggests that employees engage in greater job-related efforts and organizational commitment as they reciprocate favorable treatment received from the organization with effort and loyalty (Kurtessis et al., 2017). Instead, we presented self-efficacy to regulate work and life as an important active mechanism through which perceptions of organizational support enriched employees’ work and non-work lives, and showed that the domain-specific self-efficacy was a strong, proximal predictor of WFE and FWE. In doing so, we offer an alternative self-enhancement perspective where POS to utilize FWAs provides employees with various sources of self-efficacy to regulate work and life, which in turn makes them feel more competent and effective in engaging in their work and family roles.

Second, we supplemented research on the work/non-work interface by identifying new ways of cultivating work–family enrichment, specifically through building self-efficacy to regulate work and life. The results from our research showed that self-efficacy to regulate work and life fully mediated the relationships between POS and all three dimensions of FWE, and partially mediated the relationships between POS and all WFE dimensions. This finding suggests that self-efficacy to regulate work and life helped to translate the positive benefits of POS to utilize FWAs to the family domain, giving rise to FWE-development (e.g., skills), FWE-affect (e.g., positive mood), and FWE-efficiency (e.g., time management). The fact that
the relationships between POS and all WFE dimensions remained significant despite the addition of self-efficacy to regulate work and life as a mediator is also within expectations, since organizational support is perceived by employees in the work domain, and would naturally give rise to WFE (development, affect, and capital) as it is a positive benefit gained in the work domain (Raper et al., 2020; ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). POS may also engender positive affect (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), which enhances people’s judgments of their self-efficacy and reduces their stress reactions by altering their negative interpretations of their physical state (Bandura, 1994). Therefore, the indirect effect leading from POS to WFE (development, affect, and capital) through self-efficacy to regulate work and life is possibly one of a few significant pathways that help to translate the benefits of POS into WFE (development, affect, and capital).

Finally, we contextualized POS and self-efficacy to the work/non-work context, as we assessed employees’ perceptions of their organization’s support for their utilization of FWAs and self-efficacy to regulate work and life. Increasingly, there have been calls from scholars across all disciplines to conduct research in a contextualized manner (Härtel & O’Connor, 2014). We responded to this call by examining POS and self-efficacy in a designated context—the work/non-work interface, and in so doing, expanded the nomological network of these context-specific variables to all six dimensions of work–family enrichment. As our research has shown, contextualizing our antecedents (POS to utilize FWAs and self-efficacy to regulate work and life) to the work/non-work interface, as opposed to general POS and self-efficacy, has given us new insights into particular aspects of POS and self-efficacy that are effective in facilitating WFE (development, affect, and capital) and FWE (development, affect, and efficiency).

**Practical Implications**
One key implication of our findings is the importance of fostering perceptions of organizational support to assist employees in managing their work and non-work roles. It is imperative to recognize that facilitating work–family enrichment is not merely limited to providing FWAs (Odle-Dusseau et al., 2012). Employers evaluating their work–life balance provisions are recommended to ensure that their employees are provided with support that addresses their work and non-work concerns, because that would enhance employees’ POS (Timms et al., 2015). Additionally, given the cross-domain effects of POS on WFE and FWE through self-efficacy to regulate work and life, organizational communication (e.g., weekly e-newsletters) that encourages employees to discuss their key non-work achievements may help to enhance self-efficacy to regulate work and life collectively.

Considering the influence immediate supervisors can have on employees, our research also has implications for HR practitioners, supervisors, and employees. Because supervisors and HR practitioners can directly enhance employees’ work/non-work experiences (Brough et al., 2021), a purposeful consideration of employees’ personal lives when making daily staff-management decisions is recommended (Brough & O’Driscoll, 2010). For example, some well-intentioned family-friendly policies (e.g., long parental leave policies) have generated evidence of their negative impact upon long-term careers of carers (i.e., women; Brough et al., 2021; Hideg et al., 2018). In response, some organizations now implement ‘bridging’ programs enabling carers to stay more closely connected to their workplace whilst taking parental leave (Hideg et al., 2018). Having a nuanced understanding of the work/non-work needs of employees is thus crucial for HR practitioners and supervisors to create sustainable family-friendly environments and conduct themselves in family-supportive ways (Brough et al., 2021; Odle-Dusseau et al., 2012).

As self-efficacy to regulate work and life linked POS to both WFE and FWE, supervisors and HR practitioners seeking to enhance employees’ work–family enrichment
would also benefit from cultivating employees’ self-efficacy to regulate work and life. Generally, strategies that enhance self-efficacy beliefs include: (1) role modeling; (2) verbal persuasion, or receiving feedback and encouragement from others; (3) mastery experiences, or leveraging past experiences such as breaking a large task down into smaller steps that are more achievable; and (4) managing emotional and physiological states, as self-efficacy beliefs are strengthened by reducing anxiety and depression, and building physical strength and stamina (Bandura, 1986, 1997). To enhance employees’ self-efficacy to regulate work and life, supervisors and HR practitioners can organize intervention workshops that assist employees to set motivating but manageable work goals, and show care for employees’ non-work lives and goals. Initiatives such as work (re)design and workplace communication training, as well as involvement in career mentoring may also facilitate self-efficacy to regulate work and life (Hennessy & Lent, 2008). Finally, encouragement of employees’ reflection on their past experiences in successful work/non-work management also helps to boost their self-efficacy to regulate work and life (Bandura, 2012).

Strengths, Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Our study had several limitations. First, we relied heavily on self-report data, which may raise questions about common method variance (CMV; Podsakoff et al., 2012). Second, the SEM analyses produced fit statistics that were not within the recommended thresholds (Hu & Bentler, 1999), which are likely due to the large number of items and modest sample size in the current study (Marsh et al., 2014). Future studies are therefore, encouraged to collect a larger sample size when conducting SEM analyses, to ensure the ratio of sample size to estimated parameters is greater than 10 (Landis et al., 2000). Third, our study was only conducted across two points in time. Having at least three waves of data collection would have enabled a more detailed assessment of the proposed social cognitive process, and reduce the likelihood of inflated associations. Finally, a single-level design was employed which
focused on employees at the individual level, even though organizational support is arguably a system-level antecedent. To examine the direct impact of organizational support on employee attitudes and behaviors more accurately, a multi-level design incorporating system (e.g., organizational), group (e.g., work unit), and individual (e.g., employees) levels is required to deepen our understanding of the importance of work and non-work contexts, and to identify new ways of enabling human flourishing in organizations and families (Brough et al., in press).

While we acknowledge these limitations, the strengths of this study produce a balanced assessment of its contribution. First, we collected 12-month follow-up data to minimize contamination caused by CMV arising from the use of self-report questionnaires (Podsakoff et al., 2012). The common latent factor tests also indicated that CMV had minimal effect on the robustness of our results. Informed by strong theoretical foundations, the temporal ordering of our data across T1 and T2 contributed to the assessed dynamic processes underlying the hypothesized mediation model. We also conducted thorough data screening and testing to ensure that all outliers were eliminated, performed bias-corrected bootstrapping to control for the effects of skewness and kurtosis, and conducted a series of CFAs to demonstrate the independence of the eight self-report scales.

Conclusion

Drawing on social cognitive theory and the JDCS model, our research demonstrated that the synergistic combination of POS and self-efficacy to regulate work and life effectively fostered work–family enrichment among employees. Our findings provide managers, organizations, human resource practitioners, and employees with a deeper understanding of work–family enrichment, and highlight the role of self-efficacy to regulate work and life in facilitating work–family enrichment. Importantly, employees who successfully cultivate self-efficacy to regulate work and life will be better positioned to thrive in their work and non-
work domains, while those who do not will falter in the face of work and non-work challenges.
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Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Bivariate Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Marital status</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hours worked per week</td>
<td>38.85</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No. of dependent children</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WFE (T1)</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FWE (T2)</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. POS</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-efficacy</td>
<td>58.92</td>
<td>22.19</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. WFE-development</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. WFE-affect</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. WFE-capital</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.73**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. FWE-development</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. FWE-affect</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. FWE-efficiency</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N = 253; * p < .05; ** p < .01.
Figure 1

Structural Model (Full Mediation)
Notes. $N = 253$; Path coefficients are reported with standard errors in parentheses; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Figure 2

Structural Model (Partial Mediation)
Notes. $N = 253$; Path coefficients are reported with standard errors in parentheses; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. 
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