



## Relationship Between Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviours and Job Outcomes

Aahana Saha<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Rubina Anjum<sup>2</sup>, Dr. D.J Singh<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, CT University, <sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, CT University, <sup>3</sup> Professor, CT University

### Abstract:

The purpose of this study is to examine the connection between family-supportive supervisor behaviours (FSSB) and many work-related outcomes, such as job satisfaction, intention to leave, and interest in one's work. The study will use previously validated measures to evaluate FSSB, job satisfaction, turnover intention, and employee engagement. The associations between the variables will be analyzed using correlation and possible predictors and outcomes will be identified.

The results of this study should add to the current literature by offering empirical evidence for the link between FSSB and occupational outcomes. The hypothesis here is that FSSBs will lead to happier workers who are more invested in their jobs and less likely to leave them. Overall, this study aims to provide light on the significance of family supportive supervisor behaviours in fostering pleasant work environments and employee well-being by providing light on the association between FSSBs and job outcomes.

**Keywords:** job satisfaction, work engagement, family support supervisor behaviour, turnover intention, teachers

### Introduction

**Job satisfaction** is related to one's own overall assessment of their employment as well as the pleasant or negative feelings one experiences because of their work. It is an essential component of both employee well-being and organisational success. The workplace



environment, job features, leadership style, and unique traits can all have an impact on job satisfaction. The work environment is one aspect that influences job happiness. A supportive work environment, fair treatment, and chances for growth and development can all lead to better levels of job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2017). A bad work environment, on the other hand, characterised by disputes, unfair practises, and a lack of support, can lead to reduced job satisfaction (Podsakoff et al., 2014). Jobs that provide autonomy, variety, and meaningfulness tend to increase job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). When individuals have control over their work and perceive their tasks to be valuable, they are more likely to experience higher levels of job satisfaction. Leadership style also plays an important role in job satisfaction. Satisfaction with work is also influenced by leadership style. According to research, transformational leadership, characterised by inspiring and supportive leaders, relates to higher levels of work satisfaction (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Leaders who are viewed as domineering or negligent, on the other hand, might lead to lower levels of work satisfaction among employees. Personal qualities such as personality traits and personal beliefs might have an impact on job satisfaction. Individuals with a good attitude or high self-esteem, for example, may have greater levels of work satisfaction (Warr, 1990). Furthermore, employees who share the same personal values as the organisation are more likely to be content with their jobs (Bilsky et al., 2008). As a result, job satisfaction can be defined as an individual's subjective assessment of their overall experiences, emotions, and attitudes towards their job, which includes facets such as the workplace environment, job features, relationships with coworkers and supervisors, opportunities for growth, and personal fulfillment (Judge et al., 2017). Job satisfaction is conceptually described as a person's cognitive and affective appraisal of their work experience, which includes their level of happiness, fulfilment, and overall good or negative sentiments about their employment. It is assessed by taking into account a variety of factors like the work itself, work relationships, possibilities for growth and development, work-life balance, and overall employment circumstances (Locke, 1976). This operational definition emphasises the cognitive and emotive components of job satisfaction, recognising that it is a subjective judgement impacted by a variety of work conditions and individual experiences. Recent research has demonstrated there is a positive relationship between work satisfaction and job performance



(Judge et al., 2001). Employees that are satisfied with their jobs have greater levels of task performance, organisational citizenship behaviours, and lower levels of adverse work behaviours. Employee retention is significantly influenced by job satisfaction. Employees that are satisfied with their jobs are more likely to stay with the company, lowering turnover rates (Hom & Kinicki, 2001). High levels of job satisfaction lead to reduced leave intentions and lower actual turnover. Organisational commitment, which relates to an employee's emotional attachment, identity, and loyalty to the organisation (Meyer et al., 2002), is positively connected to job satisfaction. Satisfied employees have higher levels of emotional commitment, which leads to enhanced organisational citizenship behaviours and lower absenteeism. Job satisfaction is directly related to job engagement, which refers to an employee's level of enthusiasm, devotion, and immersion in their work (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Employees that are satisfied with their jobs are more likely to be interested in their work, which leads to better levels of productivity and performance. Employee well-being and psychological discomfort relate to greater levels of job satisfaction (Faragher et al., 2005). Employees who are satisfied report lower levels of stress, higher levels of job-related enjoyment, and better general mental health. According to Harter et al. (2002), there is a positive link between work satisfaction and customer satisfaction. Employees that are happy tend to deliver better customer service, which leads to higher customer satisfaction and loyalty.

### **Turnover intention:**

Organisations continue to be concerned with turnover intention, which shows an employee's desire or propensity to quit their current position. Researchers have been delving into the underlying elements that lead to turnover intention in recent years, recognising its influence on organisational success, employee well-being, and overall productivity. Job satisfaction is still a major factor affecting the desire to leave. Several researches have consistently found a negative association between work satisfaction and the intention to leave (Hom et al., 2012). Employees are more likely to consider quitting their present job if they have poor levels of job satisfaction, which are characterised by unhappiness with their work, salary, relationships, or overall workplace circumstances. Furthermore, research has underlined the importance of work engagement in turnover intention. Job engagement, defined as vigour,



devotion, and immersion in one's job, has been proven to have a negative relationship with turnover intention (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Employees that are engaged are more devoted to their jobs, have better job satisfaction, and have lower turnover intentions. Work-life balance has emerged as a prominent indicator of turnover intention in today's workplace. Employees' capacity to efficiently manage work and personal life obligations has become increasingly critical. Individuals are more likely to contemplate quitting their present job if they perceive a lack of work-life balance, with excessive work demands infringing on personal time and responsibilities (Allen et al., 2013). Turnover intention is an important concept in organisational psychology that represents an employee's goal or propensity to quit their current employment. It is a strong predictor of real employee turnover and has far-reaching ramifications for organisations in terms of productivity, staff retention, and organisational performance. There is a persistent positive association between turnover intention and actual turnover, according to research. Employees that show a strong desire to quit their current position are more likely to do so and willingly depart the organisation (Hom et al., 2012). It has been found that turnover intention has a detrimental influence on work performance. Employees who want to leave frequently show poorer levels of task performance, organisational citizenship behaviours, and job devotion (Maertz et al., 2007). Organisational commitment is adversely connected to turnover intention. Employees who want to leave have lower levels of affective commitment, which shows emotional attachment and loyalty to the organisation (Zhang & Morris, 2008). There is an inverse association between turnover intention and work satisfaction. Employees that are dissatisfied with their current employment are more inclined to depart (Hulin & Smith, 2000). Employees who are more satisfied with their jobs are less likely to plan to leave. Work engagement is inversely related to turnover intention. Employees who intend to leave their job are less likely to be involved in their work, displaying lower levels of vigour, devotion, and absorption (Mauno et al., 2017). Turnover intent has been connected to worse psychological well-being. Employees who want to quit their job often may feel increased stress, emotional weariness, and overall job-related discomfort (Chen et al., 2013).



## **Family supportive supervisor behaviour's (FSSB):**

The amount to which supervisors display knowledge and support for workers' family obligations and demands is referred to as family supportive supervisor behaviour (FSSB) (Hammer et al., 2011). FSSB is crucial because it has a considerable influence on employee well-being, work-family conflict, and organisational results (Kossek et al., 2016). FSSB is distinguished by several behaviours, including emotional support, flexibility in work hours and scheduling, decreasing task pressures during times of family crisis, and giving information and recommendations for family services (Kossek et al., 2016). FSSB is regularly associated with better employee outcomes, according to research. Employees who perceive high levels of FSSB from their supervisors had lower levels of work-family conflict, better levels of job satisfaction, and higher intentions to stay with their organisation, according to studies (Hammer et al., 2011; Kossek et al., 2016). It has been observed that FSSB has a good link with a variety of work outcomes. According to Hammer et al. (2011), FSSB is adversely connected to work-family conflict, which in turn is negatively related to job satisfaction. This shows that FSSB may have an indirect effect on job satisfaction through influencing work-family conflict. Eby et al., (2013) discovered that FSSB was connected to work satisfaction and organisational commitment. The study also discovered that work-family conflict mitigated the favourable connection between FSSB and job satisfaction. According to research, FSSB can have a direct influence on career results. FSSB was shown to be positively connected to intentions to stay with the organisation in a research by Kossek et al. (2016). The study also discovered that employees who felt higher levels of FSSB from their managers were less likely to abandon their employment. FSSB was shown to be positively connected to work satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intentions to stay with the organisation by Matthews and colleagues (2016). FSSB was also shown to be adversely connected to turnover intentions in the study.

Wayne and colleagues (2017) discovered that FSSB was associated with employee well-being and job performance. The study also discovered that FSSB modulated the association between work-family conflict and employee outcomes, such that when FSSB was high, the negative impact of work-family conflict on well-being and job performance was reduced.





FSSB was shown to be positively connected to work engagement and job satisfaction by Nilsen and colleagues (2018). The study also discovered that FSSB modulated the association between job demands and work engagement; such that when FSSB was high, the negative impact of job demands on work engagement was reduced.

### **Work engagement:**

Work engagement is a good and gratifying work-related condition characterised by high levels of energy, commitment, and immersion in work duties (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006). Employees that are highly engaged in their work have a feeling of purpose and meaning in their work and are more likely to have favourable employment outcomes such as job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

Work involvement has been an increasingly popular field of study in recent years, with several studies studying its origins, effects, and moderators. Understanding work engagement is essential for employers and organisations because it relates to positive employee well-being and job outcomes, and it can be used to build interventions and strategies to promote employee engagement and organisational success. Work involvement has been proven to be positively connected to work satisfaction on several occasions (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Saks, 2006; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Organisational commitment, which is the degree to which an individual identifies with and is devoted to their organisation, is positively associated to work engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Job performance, including task and contextual performance, has been proven to be positively connected to work engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Christian, Garza, & Slaughter, 2011; Salanova, Agut, & Peiró, 2005). Absenteeism, or the frequency and duration of absences from work, is adversely connected to job engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

Work engagement is inversely associated with turnover intentions (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Salanova et al., 2005). Employee health and well-being are positively associated with work engagement, including physical health, mental health, and vitality (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006; Salanova et al., 2005). Employee



creativity and invention have been proven to be positively associated to work engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Christian et al., 2011). Work engagement has been observed to be connected to psychological well-being, job-related emotions, and life satisfaction (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004). Job crafting, which refers to the process by which individuals voluntarily modify their occupations to better meet their own preferences and goals (Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2013), is positively connected to work engagement. Employee proactivity, or the amount to which workers take initiative and participate in self-directed behaviours, has been found to be positively connected to work engagement (Parker, Williams, & Turner, 2006). Work engagement has been demonstrated to moderate the association between transformative leadership and creative performance (Gong, Cheung, Wang, & Huang, 2018). Job resources such as autonomy, social support, and feedback are favourably associated to work engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004). Overall, the study indicates that work engagement is a significant predictor of positive employment outcomes such as job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, health and well-being, and creativity. These findings have significant implications for organisations and managers seeking to increase employee engagement and organisational success.

## Objectives:

- To explore the relationship between Family supportive supervisor behaviours and employee engagement.
- To assess the relationship between Family supportive supervisor behaviours and job satisfaction of employees.
- To ascertain the relationship between Family supportive supervisor behaviours and turnover intention of the employees.
- To explore the relationship between employee engagement and turnover intention of the employees.
- To determine the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction of the employees.
- To ascertain the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention of the employees.



## Hypotheses:

- There will be a positive relationship between Family supportive supervisor behaviours and employee engagement.
- There will be a positive relationship between Family supportive supervisor behaviours and the job satisfaction of employees.
- There will be a negative relationship between Family supportive supervisor behaviours and the turnover intention of the employees.
- There will be a negative relationship between employee engagement and the turnover intention of the employees.
- There will be a positive relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction of the employees.
- There will be a negative relationship between job satisfaction and the turnover intention of the employees.

## METHOD:

**Sample:** An ex post facto research design was used to explore the relationship between family supportive supervisor behaviour's, job satisfaction, turnover intention, and work engagement among university teachers. The participants for the current study consisted of 109 university teachers working in private universities in Punjab. A simple random sampling technique was used to extract the sample from the working population. 47 employees (43.11%) were female and 62 (56.88 %) were males. The sample age ranges from 29 years to 52 years.

**Statistical Method:** Data was analysed using Pearson Correlation for determining relationship and descriptive statistics such as mean, median, and mode for describing characteristics of the population. Data were analysed with the help of SPSS 22.

## Measures Used:

1. Work engagement was measured using a nine-item version of the Utrecht work engagement scale (UWES-9: Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006). According to research (Schaufeli et al., 2006), the scale's psychometric qualities are adequate. High scores mean higher engagement.





2. The Michigan Organisational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ) was used to gauge employee happiness throughout the world (Klesh, 1979; Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, Arti Bakhshi, and Richa Gupta 314, Community Psychology Association of India, 2016). There are only three questions on it, and a high score indicates high levels of contentment in one's current position.
3. There are three questions that make up the Turnover Intention Scale. The following claims are included in the survey: (a) I frequently consider leaving my current position; (b) I plan to hunt for a new job within the next year; and (c) I intend to leave the organisation as soon as I am able to do so. (Mobley et al., 1978). Each component is given a score between 0 (strongly disagree) and 4 (strongly agree) on a 5-point Likert-type ordinal scale. The first factor analyses how much workers' happiness at work affects their desire to leave their current position. The second factor analyses how seriously workers are considering leaving their current positions for better ones. Thirdly, the intention to leave the organisation is evaluated (Hom et al., 1984).

## Results and Discussions:

Table 1 depicts descriptive information about all the variables. The mean value of turnover intention is  $M=9.21$  and the standard deviation is  $SD= 2.89$ . Simultaneously the mean score of job satisfaction is  $M= 13.70$ , while the Standard deviation is  $SD= 2.39$ . Furthermore, the mean score for work engagement is  $M=42.31$  and the standard deviation is  $SD=9.32$ . Family supportive supervisor behaviours are having a mean score of  $M= 45.35$  and a standard deviation, of  $SD=10.14$ .

**Table 1** *Descriptive statistics for Turnover intention, job satisfaction, work engagement and family supportive supervisor behaviours.*

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Turnover Intervention	9.2178	2.89000	109
Job satisfaction	13.7030	2.39393	109
Work engagement	42.3168	9.32516	109
FSSB	45.3564	10.14750	109



**Table 2 Correlation Matrix for Turnover intention, job satisfaction, work engagement and family supportive supervisor behaviours.**

	Turnover intention	Job satisfaction	Work engagement	FSSB's
Turnover intention	1			
Job satisfaction	-.272**	1		
Work engagement	-.423**	.560**	1	.
FSSB's	-.326**	.388**	.474**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2 showed that Family supportive supervisor behaviours were found to be positively correlated with employee engagement ( $r = -.47, p < 0.01$ ). This signifies that an increase in Family supportive supervisor behaviour's leads to an increase in the work engagement of university teachers. Hypothesis stating "Family supportive supervisor behaviors are positively related to employee engagement" is supported. Furthermore, Table 2 also demonstrates that family supportive supervisor behaviour's are positively correlated ( $r = .38, p < 0.01$ ) with university teachers job satisfaction. This means that hypotheses stating "There will be a positive relationship between Family supportive supervisor behaviours and job satisfaction of employees" also stand supported. The results of correlation matrix in Table 2 revealed a negative correlation between Family supportive supervisor behaviours and turnover intention of the employees ( $r = -.32, p < 0.01$ ). Hence hypothesis stating "There will be negative relationship Family supportive supervisor behaviours and turnover intention of the employees" is also supported. Pearson correlation method determined a negative correlation between employee engagement and turnover intention ( $r = -.42, p < 0.01$ ). Therefore, hypotheses stating "There will be negative relationship between employee engagement and turnover intention of the employees" stand supported too. A positive correlation was also found between employee engagement and job satisfaction ( $r = .56, p < 0.01$ ). Hypotheses stating, "There will be a negative relationship between employee engagement and turnover intention of the employees". Simultaneously a negative correlation



was also found between job satisfaction and turnover intention ( $r = -.27, p < 0.01$ ) hence hypothesis stating “There will be a negative relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention of the employees” stands supportive too.

## **Discussion:**

The results of the current study are in line with the literature already available Lamm & colleagues, (2017) discovered that FSSB positively influenced employee work engagement. This implies that when managers are supportive of their workers' family commitments, it increases their involvement at work. FSSB has also been linked to a decrease in turnover intention. According to Wayne et al., (2017), greater levels of FSSB are related to decreased employee turnover intentions. This suggests that when managers help employees with their family requirements, it lessens their desire to quit the company. Casper & colleagues, (2018) discovered that FSSB was strongly connected to better work satisfaction among employees in their study. This implies that when managers are supportive of their workers' family obligations, it improves their overall workplace happiness. Research suggests a strong link between turnover intention and jobsatisfaction. According to studies, there is a link between turnover intention, job satisfaction, and work engagement. Employees who are unsatisfied with their jobs and lack engagement are more likely to plan to leave. Masood et al., (2020) discovered a negative association between work satisfaction and desire to leave. The researchers polled employees from numerous industries and discovered that those who were dissatisfied with their jobs were more inclined to consider quitting their present employer. The study also emphasised the need to resolve work satisfaction concerns to lessen the likelihood of turnover. Similarly, Bakker, Demerouti, and Verbeke (2004) investigated the association between work engagement and the desire to leave. Employees with greater levels of work engagement were shown to be less likely to intend to leave their present employment. The study emphasised the importance of job engagement in increasing employee commitment and decreasing inclinations to leave.

## **Implications:**

The findings of the present study on supervisors' family supportive actions have a significant bearing on several occupational outcomes. When we talk about these kinds of activities and



support from managers, we're referring to the ways in which they encourage their staff to maintain a healthy work-life balance. Let's look at some of the most important conclusions we can get from current knowledge. Employees report higher levels of satisfaction with their jobs when their supervisors are family friendly. Employees are more likely to be happy in their jobs when their managers are considerate of their personal lives. This is one of the first studies on university teachers with the aspect of family supportive supervisor behaviours. Organisations should look at ways to enhance supportive behaviours of supervisors in order to tackle different workplace strains. The extent to which a supervisor is family-friendly has a direct bearing on how well their staff members are able to juggle their personal and professional lives. It has been shown via studies that when managers are understanding and accommodating, workers have fewer problems balancing their personal and professional life. Family supportive supervisor behaviour's is a trainable resource that can help organisations to deal with day-to-day workplace strain to enhance the wellbeing of employees and in turn organization too.

### **Future suggestions:**

The prevalence of workplace strains in today's organisations is part and parcel of one's job and these strains have this tendency to influence the overall well-being of the employees in a negative way. People working in the private sector are more vulnerable to these strains due to so many reasons. Teachers working in private universities in India are in no way an exception to these strains. Lack of job security, long working hours, and pay disparities are some of the most prevalent strains when it comes to private university teachers. Universities should encourage the use of easily available resources that can be used effectively to deal with day-to-day workplace strains. That is why more thorough research into facets like FSSBs should be encouraged more. A more empirical approach towards the study like the present one is suggested. less number of participants is one of the limitations of the present study, future researchers should work on a larger sample so that more generalised results can be obtained. A larger demographical reach is also suggested for the future research into the facet of family supportive supervisor behaviours.



## References:

- Casper, W. J., Martin, J. A., Buffardi, L. C., Erdwins, C. J., & O'Connell, K. M. (2018). Family-supportive supervision and employee job satisfaction: The mediating effects of work-family conflict and enrichment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 23(1)*, 35-48.
- Lamm, E., Tosti-Kharas, J., & King, E. B. (2017). The role of supportive work-family practices in the relationships between work-family culture and employee well-being. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 32(2)*, 125-142.
- Wayne, J. H., Casper, W. J., Matthews, R. A., & Allen, T. D. (2017). Family-supportive organization perceptions, multiple dimensions of work-family conflict, and employee satisfaction: A test of model across five samples. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 98*, 183-197.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3)*, 309-328.
- Gong, Y., Cheung, S. Y., Wang, M., & Huang, J. C. (2018). Unpacking the link between transformational leadership and employee creativity: The role of psychological empowerment and work engagement. *Journal of Business Research, 88*, 352-360.
- Halbesleben, J. R., & Buckley, M. R. (2004). Burnout in organizational life. *Journal of Management, 30(6)*, 859-879.
- Parker, S. K., Williams, H. M., & Turner, N. (2006). Modeling the antecedents of proactive behavior at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(3)*, 636-652.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2013). The impact of job crafting on job demands, job resources, and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 18(2)*, 230-240.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22(3)*, 273-285.
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology, 64(1)*, 89-136.



- Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology, 43*(6), 495-513.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(7), 600-619.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*(3), 293-315.
- Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiró, J. M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1217-
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 273-285.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66*(4), 701-716.
- Matthews, R. A., Barnes-Farrell, J. L., & Shockley, K. M. (2016). Workplace social support in a cross-cultural context: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 21*(2), 137-152.
- Nilsen, M. C., Holman, D., & Erickson, A. (2018). Linking family-supportive supervisor behavior and work engagement: The mediating role of organizational family-friendly policies and practices. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 106*, 107-117.
- Wayne, J. H., Grzywacz, J. G., Carlson, D. S., & Kacmar, K. M. (2017). Work-family facilitation: A theoretical explanation and model of primary antecedents and consequences. *Human Resource Management Review, 27*(2), 268-283.
- Chen, Y. H., Tsai, Y. M., & Chen, C. Y. (2013). The relationship between organizational climate, job stress, workplace burnout, and retention in a sample of Taiwanese nurses. *BMC Health Services Research, 13*(1), 1-13.





- Hom, P. W., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Griffeth, R. W. (2012). Reviewing employee turnover: Focusing on proximal withdrawal states and an expanded criterion. *Psychological Bulletin, 138*(5), 831-858.
- Hulin, C. L., & Smith, P. C. (2000). Personnel selection and placement. In S. R. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 499-524). *Blackwell Publishing*.
- Maertz Jr, C. P., Griffeth, R. W., Campbell, N. S., & Allen, D. G. (2007). The effects of perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support on employee turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*(8), 1059-1075.
- Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U., & Ruokolainen, M. (2017). Job demands and resources as antecedents of work engagement: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 98*, 157-169.
- Zhang, Y., & Morris, L. F. (2008). Job attitudes, turnover intentions, job satisfaction and organizational commitment in China: A latent growth modeling approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 73*(1), 1-15.
- Faragher, E. B., Cass, M., & Cooper, C. L. (2005). The relationship between job satisfaction and health: A meta-analysis. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 62*(2), 105-112.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(2), 268-279.
- Hom, P. W., & Kinicki, A. J. (2001). Toward a greater understanding of how dissatisfaction drives employee turnover. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(5), 975-987.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*(3), 376-407.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*(1), 20-52.



- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*(3), 293
- Bilsky, W., Janik, M., & Schwartz, S. H. (2008). The structural organization of human values—Evidence from three rounds of the European Social Survey (ESS). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 39*(3), 339-357.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 755-768.
- Judge, T. A., Rodell, J. B., Klinger, R. L., Simon, L. S., & Crawford, E. R. (2017). Hierarchical representations of the five-factor model of personality in predicting job performance: Integrating three organizing frameworks with two theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(12), 1678-1698.
- Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2014). Differential challenge stressor-hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(2), 279-306.
- Warr, P. (1990). The measurement of well-being and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*(3), 193-210.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Rand McNally.
- Judge, T. A., Rodell, J. B., Klinger, R. L., Simon, L. S., & Crawford, E. R. (2017). Hierarchical representations of the five-factor model of personality in predicting job performance: Integrating three organizing frameworks with two theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(12), 1678-1698.
- Allen, T. D., French, K. A., Dumani, S., & Shockley, K. M. (2013). Meta-analysis of work-family conflict mean differences: Does national context matter? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 83*(3), 68-77.



- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (2014). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 698-714.
- Hom, P. W., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Griffeth, R. W. (2012). Reviewing employee turnover: Focusing on proximal withdrawal states and an expanded criterion. *Psychological Bulletin, 138*(5), 831-858.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*(3), 293-315.
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Anger, W. K., Bodner, T., & Zimmerman, K. L. (2011). Clarifying work-family intervention processes: The roles of work-family conflict and family-supportive supervisor behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(1), 134-150.
- Kossek, E. E., Baltes, B. B., Matthews, R. A., DeGrace, B., & Tuller, D. (2016). Socialization of work-life policies and practices: Work-life training in organizations. In M. Pitt-Catsouphes, E. E. Kossek, & S. Sweet (Eds.), *Handbook of the Sociology of Aging* (pp. 461-481). Springer.
- Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2013). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980–2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63*(1), 136-165.
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Anger, W. K., Bodner, T., & Zimmerman, K. L. (2011). Clarifying work-family intervention processes: The roles of work-family conflict and family-supportive supervisor behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(1), 134-150., 73(1), 1-15.