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ABSTRACT The paper aimed to test the hypotheses that organisational interventions (job characteristics, work-life benefits and policies (WLBP), supervisor support and work-family culture) would be positively related to job outcomes (job satisfaction, affective commitment, organisational citizenship behaviour) and work-to-family enrichment would be mediating these relationships. Data were collected on 216 managerial employees from four organisations in India through a structured questionnaire and analyzed using hierarchical multiple regressions. Results showed that job characteristics were positively related to all measures of job outcomes, while WLBP was not related to any of them. Supervisor support and work-family culture showed positive association only with job satisfaction and affective commitment. Work-to-family enrichment fully mediated the relationship only between job characteristics and job outcomes.
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Work-life balance has become a subject matter of concern to scholars as well as business leaders because of the contemporary demographic, technological, market and organisational changes and changes in the individual expectations and aspirations (Sekaran 1992; Ramu 1989; Bharat 2003; Komarraju 1997; Rajadhyaksha & Bhatnagar 2000; Aryee, Srinivas & Tan 2005; Cooper 1998; Hewitt Salary Attrition Survey, 2006; Census of India 1991, 2001). Given the implications of work-life balance on employee attitudes, behaviours, well-being as well as organisational effectiveness (for a review see Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux & Brinley 2005; Frone 2003) organisations have been forced to introduce interventions to help employees manage the competing demands of work and family lives while being productive at work place. Some of these interventions could be re-designing jobs to provide employees more autonomy and variety (job characteristics), providing benefits and policies such as flexitime (WLBP), supervisor support and developing a family-friendly organisational culture (work-family culture). Research has shown positive benefits of such interventions on individual’s degree of job satisfaction, level of commitment and engagement in pro-social behaviours. To elaborate, nature of job significantly influences employee attachment to organisation (Meyer & Allen 1997), job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham 1976) and organisational citizenship behaviour (Farh, Podsakoff & Organ 1990; Morrison 1994). WLBP's positively influence job satisfaction (Kossek & Ozeki 1998), organisational commitment (Eaton 2003) and organisational
citizenship behaviour (Lambert 2000). Work-family culture and supervisor support positively influence organisational commitment (Thomas & Ganster 1995), job satisfaction (Thompson, Beauvais & Lyness 1999; Allen 2001) and organisational citizenship behaviour (Organ & Ryan 1995). Since, in recent years organisations in India too have started introducing such interventions to deal with employee work-life balance issues (Poster 2005), it is imperative to examine to what extent these interventions actually affect employee job outcomes in India.

At academic front, scholars (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne & Grzywacz 2006; Wayne, Randel & Stevens 2006; Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair & Shafiro, 2005; Graves, Ohlott & Ruderman 2007; Balmforth & Gardner 2006) have made an effort to examine the positive impact of work-family interface referred as work-family enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell 2006) on individual’s attitude and behaviour. Work-family enrichment focuses on the positive effect of work on family lives (work-to-family enrichment) and vice versa (family-to-work enrichment) and both have significant impact on individual’s mental health (Grzywacz & Bass 2003), psychological well-being (Stephens, Franks & Atienza 1997), family functioning (Grzywacz & Marks 2000b) and job outcomes such as job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Wayne, Musisca & Fleeson 2004; Wayne et al. 2006). Nonetheless, studies on work-family enrichment are still less to affirm the results so far. Given the organisational implications of work-family enrichment, it is also necessary to understand whether and to what extent the organisational interventions for work-life balance influence employee functioning in the family. Extrapolating the findings of some researchers with regard to the mediation role of work-family conflict (Anderson, Coffey & Byerly 2002), we believe that work-family enrichment may be an important mechanism for influencing the relationship between organisational interventions and job outcomes. Hence, the purpose of the present paper is twofold. First is to examine the impact of organisational interventions such as job characteristics, WLBPs, work-family culture and supervisor support on job outcomes and work-family enrichment. Second is to explore the possible mediating role of work-to-family enrichment.

**LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES**

Literature suggests that employees in jobs high on certain core job dimensions such as autonomy, variety, task identity, task significance and feedback (Hackman & Oldham 1975) experience a sense
of meaning, derive a sense of personal fulfilment and motivation and as a result feel greater attachment towards their organisation and feel more satisfied with their job (Hackman & Oldham 1975; Flynn & Tannenbum 1993; Loher, Noe, Moeller & Fitzgerald 1985). Increased amount of control and discretion over working conditions and scope for social interactions should also give employees the opportunity to engage in organisational citizenship behaviours (Farh, Podsakoff & Organ 1990; Morrison 1994). Positive effects of job characteristics on individual’s family have also been a subject of investigation (Grzywacz & Marks 2000a; Geurts & Demerouti 2003; Voydanoff 2004; Grzywacz & Butler 2005; Thompson & Pratts 2005). It is believed that, intrinsically motivating factors namely autonomy, variety, identity, significance and feedback (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), provide fulfilling experience, control over the work-family matters, help gain efficiency, energy and motivation to indulge in family activities and help in acquiring new skills and attitudes that can be mobilized to facilitate functioning in family domain (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Geurts & Demerouti, 2003). Hence, we hypothesize that,

Hypothesis 1a. Job characteristics will be positively related to job satisfaction, organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour

Hypothesis 1b. Job characteristics will be positively related to work-to-family enrichment

Apart from designing jobs to provide more autonomy and variety, organisations do offer their employees many policies and working arrangements to help them manage the demands of work and family lives (Moore 1996) typically defined as family-friendly policies (FFPs) or work-life benefits and policies (WLBP) (Goodstein 1994; Osterman 1995; Dex & Scheibl 1999). They include alternate working arrangements, leave in lieu of family reasons, financial assistance for child care and information services such as finding a childcare center and school in nearby area for a new employee etc. Individual and organisational benefits of such provisions include reduced work-family conflict (Thomas & Ganster 2005), increased job satisfaction (Kossek & Ozeki 1998), organisational commitment (Scandura & Lankau 1997; Grover & Crooker 1995; Osterman 1995) and organisational citizenship behaviour (Lambert 2000). WLBP's create a sense of assurance for employees that their organisation/employer is supportive of employee well-being and non-work related needs. According to perceived organisational support theory (Eisenberger, Hungtinton, Hutchison & Sowa 1986) and
social exchange theory (Blau 1964) the feeling of supportiveness will result into higher positive attitudes towards the organisation and will promote employee participation and initiative through a felt obligation to give extra effort in return for additional benefits (Lambert 2000). The impact of WLBP on work-family enrichment has hardly been examined. Moreover, the only study (Wayne et al. 2006) examining the relationship between WLBP and work-family enrichment did not find support for the hypothesized positive association, which warrants further examination. Theoretically, WLBP should improve employee efficiency and performance since they are instrumental in helping employees manage their work and family responsibilities. Since, employers in India provide little formal family support programs for their employees compared to those in western countries (Poster 2005) it is interesting to explore what role such formal supports play in enhancing the quality of work-life interface. Furthermore, we believe that employees in collectivist culture like India are more likely to expect being taken care of by their organisations as a return for their loyalty and hence when provided with such supports will feel more obliged towards their organisation. Based on these theoretical rationales and existing literature, we hypothesize that,

Hypothesis 2a. Work-life benefits and policies (WLBP) will be positively related to job satisfaction, organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour.  
Hypothesis 2b. Work-life benefits and policies (WLBP) will be positively related to work-to-family enrichment.

Despite their popularity, formal organisational supports such as WLBP may not be as important as how supportive organisational culture is towards work-life balance or how supportive an employee’s supervisor is (Thompson & Prottas 2005). Family-supportive organisational culture typically referred as work-family culture is defined as ‘the shared assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding the extent to which an organisation supports and values the integration of employees’ work and family lives (Thompson et al. 1999). Based on perceived organisational support theory (Eisenberger et al. 1986) and the assumptions that unwritten rules and expectations are more powerful in influencing attitudes and behaviours than formal and written rules (O’Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell 1991), past research findings suggest that feeling supported at work is related to increased satisfaction and greater organisational commitment (Allen 2001; Mauno, Kinnunen & Ruokolainen 2006; Lyness...
Thompson, Francesco & Judiesch 1999; Thompson et al. 1999). It also enhances psychological resources such as self-acceptance (Friedman & Greenhaus 2000), performance and well-being in the family (Wayne et al. 2006), suggesting the possibility of work-to-family enrichment. Hence, we hypothesize that,

**Hypothesis 3a.** Work-family culture will be positively related to job satisfaction, affective commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour

**Hypothesis 3b.** Work-family culture will be positively related to work-to-family enrichment.

Another significant aspect of culture that is supervisor support in work-family issues reflects employees’ perceptions of whether their immediate supervisor is sensitive to their non-work-related matters. Supervisor can reduce the extent to which employee’s work role interferes with his/her family role by accommodating employee’s family obligations (Lapierre & Allen 2006) such as letting an employee leave work early to take care of a sick child or parent. It is found that employees who perceive their supervisor as supportive of work-family matters are more likely to be satisfied and committed to their jobs (Aryee et al. 2005). Based on social exchange theory, it is likely that employees will render more citizenship behaviours in return to the support they get from their supervisors. Supervisors can alleviate most of the work related tension and strain (Beehr, Jex, Stacy & Murray 2000), which would potentially provide energy to participate in family related activities suggesting work-to-family enrichment (Wadsworth & Owens 2007). Hence, we hypothesize that,

**Hypothesis 4a.** Supervisor support will be positively related to job satisfaction, organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour

**Hypothesis 4b.** Supervisor support will be positively related to work-to-family enrichment

**Mediating role of work-family enrichment**

Researchers have investigated work-family conflict as a mediator between various work and family demands and employee attitude and behaviour (Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk & Beutell 1996; Frone, Russell & Cooper 1997). There is a possibility that work-family enrichment also plays a mediating role between organizational interventions for work-life balance and job outcomes. Literature suggests that the nature of job and the kind of support system in the work domain plausibly increases the efficiency of an employee in his/her family domain (Wayne et al. 2006). It is likely that individuals will attribute their increased efficiency and performance to the domain that provide such
support system and hence will feel more satisfied with that domain and commitment towards that domain. Moreover, we expect that workplace related variables will influence the individual level construct that is work-to-family enrichment before having impact on organisational outcomes. Hence, we propose that,

_Hypothesis 5. Work-to-family enrichment will mediate the relationship between the independent variables (i.e., job characteristics, WLBP, work-family culture and supervisor support) and the outcome variables (job satisfaction, organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour)_

**METHOD**

**Data and Procedures**

Data for the study were collected through a structured questionnaire from 216 managers employed in two manufacturing and two information technology organisations situated in the western part of India. The survey booklet containing a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study, instructions for completing the questionnaire, the study measures, and the demographic details were distributed personally to randomly selected samples in each organisation. Participants were assured of their anonymity and confidentiality of their responses. Of the 216 participants, 79.4% were male, 50.5% were married and 70.9% were living in a nuclear family. Out of married employees, 39% had children. A majority of the sample (65%) was in junior management positions, 70% were employed in software organisations. 56.9% were graduates and 43.1% were postgraduates. The mean age of the respondents was 29.61 (S.D.=6.73) years and mean tenure in the organisation was 2.8 years. 39.9% respondents reported their annual personal income to be more than Rs. 5 Lakhs (13,076 AUD, 11037 USD). Average working hours per week was reported as 46.39 (S.D.=3.11; range 30-72 hours).

**Measures**

*Job characteristics* was measured using a 7-item subscale of a larger measure originally created by Hackman and Oldham (1975) and later on revised by Idaszak and Drasgow (1987). The items were adapted and were rewritten to be shorter and appropriate for the present study. Participants indicated the extent to which each of the characteristics was present in their current job using 7-point anchors from ‘very little’ to ‘very much’.
Work-Life Benefits and Policies: Participants were given a list of 22 work-life benefits commonly offered by organisations and were asked to state whether those policies/benefits (e.g., option to choose their own starting and quitting times, flexible working hours, option to work at home, part-time working arrangement, compressed work week, shorter work arrangement, job sharing, leave in lieu of family reasons, sabbatical leave, childcare center, insurance policy for self and for family, health and medical benefits for self and for family, education assistance for self and employees’ children, stress management programmes, social events, fitness centers, cafeteria, medical facility and conveyance facility) were available in their respective organisations. The respondents indicated their response by “no” or “yes”. Available benefits were coded “1”, otherwise “0”. A summed score of the policies and benefits was computed so that a higher score indicated a greater number of benefits available.

Work-Family Culture was measured by an adapted 9-items short version (Lyness et al. 1999) of work-family culture scale. Respondents indicated their agreement or disagreement to each statement on a 5-point Likert scale (‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’). Negatively worded items were reverse-scored and responses were summed across the nine items so that a high score represented a supportive work-family culture.

Supervisor Support was measured using four items from the social support scale developed by Caplan, Cobb, French, Van Harrison and Pinneau (1975). The respondents indicated the extent to which support is received from their immediate supervisor on a 5-point Likert scale (‘not at all’ to ‘very much’).

Work-to-Family Enrichment was measured using nine items from work-family enrichment scale developed by Carlson et al. (2006). Respondents indicated their agreement or disagreement to each statement on a 5-point Likert scale (‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’).

Job Satisfaction was measured using an adapted version of 6-items job satisfaction scale by Agho, Price and Mueller (1992) which has been extensively used by scholars in India over the years and found to be reliable (Kumar, 2001; Singh, 2007). Respondents indicated their agreement or disagreement to each statement on a 5-point Likert scale (‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’).

Organizational commitment was measured using 6-items affective commitment scale of Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993). Respondents indicated their agreement or disagreement to each statement on
a 7-point Likert scale (‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’). *Organisational Citizenship Behaviour* was measured using 8 items from the scale developed by Lee and Allen (2002). Participants responded using a 5-point Likert-scale (‘never’ to ‘always’). All the scales were pilot tested for reliability before the main study. The Cronbach’s alpha (reliability) for all the scales were above .70 (Table 1) in the present study.

**Control Variables:** We assessed and controlled for respondent’s gender, age, marital status, education, job level, organisational tenure, work hours and annual personal income.

**RESULTS**

Means, standard deviations, and correlations among all the variables were calculated and are shown in Table 1. Significant bivariate association were found among the study variables. [Insert Table 1 about here]. To test hypotheses 1 to 4 we entered each predictor variable stepwise and for hypothesis 5 we tested for mediation using Baron and Kenny’s (1986) mediated regression technique and used Sobel’s (1982) test to determine the significance of the mediation. In the first step, we always entered control variables as a set. The results (Table 2) indicate that the control variables accounted for 4 % of the variance associated with work-to-family enrichment (F=1.17, p > .05) and 7% with job satisfaction (F=1.92, P>.05), 5% with organisational commitment (F=1.42, P>.05) and 14 % with organisational citizenship behaviour respectively (F=4.11, P<.001). [Insert Table 2 about here].

**Direct effects of organisational interventions for work-life balance on job outcomes**

The hypotheses 1a, 2a, 3a and 4a stated that job characteristics, WLBP, work-family culture and supervisor support would be positively related to job satisfaction, affective commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour. Results (Table 2) indicate that after controlling for the effect of demographic variables, job characteristics was positively associated with job satisfaction ($\beta = .28$, p<.001), affective commitment ($\beta = .17$, p<.05) and organisational citizenship behaviour ($\beta = .15$, p<.05) providing full support for hypotheses 1a. WLBP was not related with any of the job outcomes thus providing no support for hypothesis 2a. Work-family culture was significantly related with job satisfaction ($\beta = .17$, p<.05) and affective commitment ($\beta = .25$, p<.01), providing partial support for hypothesis 3a. Supervisor support was significantly associated only with affective commitment
providing partial support for hypothesis 4a. Hence, these results provide full support for hypothesis 1a, no support for hypothesis 2a and partial support for hypotheses 3a and 4a.

**Direct effects of organisational interventions for work-life balance on work-to-family enrichment**

The hypotheses 1b, 2b, 3b and 4b stated that job characteristics, WLBP, work-family culture and supervisor support would be positively related to work-to-family enrichment. Results of the regression analyses (Table 2) suggest that only job characteristics (β = .36, p<.001) and supervisor support (β = .26, p<.01) were significantly associated with work-to-family enrichment. These results provide full support only for hypotheses 1b, and 4b and no support for hypotheses 2b and 3b.

**Mediation effect of work-to-family enrichment**

The procedures recommended by Baron and Kenny (1986) were used to test the mediating effect of work-to-family enrichment on the relationship between the predictor and criterion variables (hypothesis 5). Following the prescribed steps, we conducted three regressions: i) The mediator (work-to-family enrichment) was regressed on the independent variables (e.g., job characteristics), ii) the dependent variables (e.g., job satisfaction) were regressed on the independent variables (e.g., job characteristics), and iii) the dependent variables (e.g., job satisfaction) were simultaneously regressed on both mediator and the independent variables. According to Barron & Kenny’s Model, mediation is present if the following conditions hold true: the independent variable affects the mediator in the first equation; the independent variable affects the dependent variable in the second equation and the mediator affects the dependent variable in the third equation. The effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable must be less in the third equation than in the second. Full mediation occurs if the independent variable has no significant effect when the mediator is in the equation and partial mediation occurs if the effect of the independent variable is smaller but significant when the mediator is in the equation.

Results suggest that after controlling for the effect of demographic variables, only job characteristics was significantly associated with the purported mediator that is work-to-family enrichment (β = .36, p<.001) and all the dependent variables that is job satisfaction (β = .28, p<.001), affective commitment (β = .17, p<.05) and organisational citizenship behaviour (β = .15, p<.05) (Table 2) thus fulfilling the first and second condition for mediation test. The third condition of
mediation was also met where work-to-family enrichment was significantly associated with job satisfaction ($\beta = .50, p<.001, R^2 = .36$), affective commitment ($\beta = .20, p<.01, R^2 = .20$) and organisational citizenship behaviour ($\beta = .22, p<.01, R^2 = .24$). Hence, we assessed the mediating effect of work-to-family enrichment (the mediator) on the relationship between job characteristics (the predictor) and each of the criterion variables in three independent regression models.

The final step in the process of demonstrating mediation is to show that when the effect of the presumed mediator is controlled for, the effect of the predictor is minimized or becomes insignificant altogether. This was assessed by regressing outcome variables simultaneously on independent variables and mediator. In case of job satisfaction, the effects of job characteristics became insignificant (F-change = 1.73, p>.05 $R^2$ change = .01, $\beta = .10, t = 1.35, p>.05$), indicating the complete mediation effect of work-to-family enrichment. The same analysis was performed with job characteristics as the predictor and affective commitment as the criterion, and taking work-to-family enrichment as the possible mediator. In case of affective commitment, the effect of job characteristics lessened (F-change = 4.00, p<.05, $R^2$ change = .06, $\beta = .10, t = 1.25, p>.05$). Since the $R^2$ change and F-change were significant, work-to-family enrichment satisfied the requirements of a partial mediator in the relationship between the job characteristics and affective commitment. In case of organisational citizenship behaviour, after controlling for the effect of work-to-family enrichment, the effect of job characteristics became insignificant (F-change = 1.10, p>.05, $R^2$ change = .02, $\beta = .07, t = .864, p>.05$), indicating the complete mediation effect of work-to-family enrichment.

To conduct formal test of the mediation effect, we performed Sobel tests using calculator available at http://www.psych.ku.edu/preacher/sobel/sobel.htm. The results indicated a significant mediating effect of work-to-family enrichment between job characteristics and job satisfaction (Sobel = 5.41, $p < .001$), between job characteristics and affective commitment (Sobel = 2.08, $p < .05$) and job characteristics and organisational citizenship behaviour (Sobel = 2.79, $p < .01$). Results indicate that our mediation hypothesis (hypothesis 5) was partially supported. Work-to-family enrichment fully mediated the relationship between job characteristics and job satisfaction as well as organisational citizenship behaviour and partially mediated the relationship between job characteristics and affective commitment.
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings suggest that employees having motivating jobs are likely to be satisfied with their jobs, attached to their organisation and engage in pro-social behaviours. Our results support the positive effects of job characteristics on work-related attitudes (Hackman & Oldham 1976), employee well-being and family lives (Thompson & Prottas 2005; Voydanoff 2004).

Surprisingly, contrary to the past research (Grover & Crooker 1995; Kossek & Ozeki 1998), we did not find any support for the positive impact of WLBPs on job outcomes which is consistent with other research findings (Allen 2001; Wayne et al. 2006). Perhaps, generalized policies such as flexible working hours and compressed work weeks which are likely to benefit all were perceived to be more salient to our respondents than specific WLBP such as child-care support. Research findings (Anderson et al. 2002; Behson 2005; Thompson & Prottas 2005) also suggest that informal aspects of the work environment such as supervisor and co-worker support explain greater share of the variance associated with employee outcomes than do formal benefits and policies. We did not find a positive relationship between WLBP and work-to-family enrichment which supports the results of Wayne et al. (2004). It may be that developmental policies and practices such as training programmes are more likely to enhance skills and knowledge required to improve performance in family than WLBPs.

Adding to previous research (Wadsworth & Owens 2007; Thompson & Prottas 2005), our results highlight the positive impact of supervisor support on work-to-family enrichment. It suggests that supervisor support probably generates positive affect at workplace which when transfers to family domains positively influences employee attitude and performance. In line with the literature (Mottaz 1988), supervisor support also predicted affective commitment. This finding suggest that employees are more likely to feel obligation to return the supportive behaviour in terms of affective commitment (Shore & Wayne 1993). However, contrary to past research (Aryee et al. 2005) supervisor support did not predict job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour. Probably, supervisor support creates an obligation to indulge more in in-role behaviours than in extra-role behaviours such as citizenship behaviour.

Consistent with prior research (Thompson et al. 1999; Allen 2001), the results of our study suggest the positive impact of supportive work-family culture on job satisfaction and organisational
commitment. However, it was not related to organisational citizenship behaviour that warrants further examination.

In line with literature (Gryzywacz & Butler 2005; Wadsworth & Owens 2007), our findings suggest that among the organisational interventions for work-life balance, only job characteristics and supervisor support significantly influence work-to-family enrichment. The results of the present study confirms and extends the results of some of the recent research findings (Wayne et al. 2004, 2006; Thompson & Pratt 2005) with regard to positive impact of work-to-family enrichment on job outcomes and contributes to the emerging trends in positive psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi 2000) and organisational behaviour (Luthans 2002). Considering the significant effect of work-to-family enrichment on job outcomes, it should be addressed in organisations. Employees should be encouraged and provided enough scope to participate in non-work domain activities. HR managers should regularly obtain information (e.g., via surveys, interviews, and through personal discussions) on the extent to which organisational members succeed in combining work and family and to what extent both the roles facilitate each other.

With regard to mediation, our results suggest that work-to-family enrichment mediate the relationships between job characteristics and job outcomes. That is, job design has significant association with employee perception of work-to-family enrichment, which in turn increases the positive job attitudes and citizenship behaviours. The findings suggest that employers should consider job design as a part of organisational intervention in order to address work-life balance.

Since our research is cross-sectional in nature, it is difficult to draw any conclusions about the causality among variables. Future research needs to longitudinally explore these relationships over time and examine the long-term effects of organisational interventions (e.g., job redesign and WLBP) on the ability of employees to integrate work and family. Further research should use larger samples and include more organisations in variety of industries and locations.
Table 1: Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities and Intercorrelations among Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</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>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion Variables</strong></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Work-to-Family Enrichment</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>(.87)</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>(.69)</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organisational Citizenship Behaviour</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.33** .31** (.82)</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Affective Commitment</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.28** .34** .14* (.77)</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predictor Variables</strong></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work-Life Benefits and Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.24** .12 .18** .11 ----</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job Characteristics</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.43** .35** .25** .24** .33** (.75)</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervisor Support</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.33** .17* .16* .20** .25** .21** (.75)</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Work-Family Culture</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.19** .24** .09 .29** .36* .26** .19** (.78)</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Age</td>
<td>29.61</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Education</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Organisational Tenure</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Income</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hours of Work per Week</td>
<td>46.39</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Job Level</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Gender</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Marital Status</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 216; * p<.05,  ** p<.01, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients are reported in parentheses on the diagonal. Age (in years), education (1=graduate, 2=post graduate), organizational tenure (years of service in the organization), Income (Annual personal income in Rupees, 1=less than .5 Million, 2=More than .5 Million), work hours (average hours worked per week), job level (1=junior management, 2=senior management). Gender (1=male, 2=female), marital status (1=unmarried, 2=married).
### Table 2: Results of Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Enrichment</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Organisational Citizenship Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Level</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Tenure</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Hour</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Characteristics</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Life Benefits and Policies</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Family Culture</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-Family Enrichment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total F</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>6.5***</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>3.67***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² Change</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Change</td>
<td>16.50***</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>6.75***</td>
<td>54.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N=216, * p<.05,  ** p<.01, *** p<.001  Values in tables are standardized beta coefficients. Model 1 includes only the variables listed in Step 1, Model 2 includes the variables listed in Steps 1 and 2, and Model 3 includes variables listed in Steps 1, 2, and 3.
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