

A Daily Diary Study of Work-Life Balance: Utilizing a Daily Process Model

Associate Professor Jarrod M. Haar

University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand

E-mail: haar@waikato.ac.nz

Maree Roche

Waikato Institute of Technology, Hamilton, New Zealand

E-mail: maree.roche@wintec.ac.nz

Lieke L. ten Brummelhuis

Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

A Daily Diary Study of Work-Life Balance: Utilizing a Daily Process Model

We extend the daily dairy wellbeing literature by unravelling daily work and family factors and their influence on employee wellbeing in a sample of managers and business owners. Four days diary data was collected from 113 respondents and analysed using multi-level statistical analysis. Daily family-work conflict positively influenced daily job burnout, while daily autonomy satisfaction reduced burnout. Daily family-work enrichment positively influenced daily work engagement, as did daily needs satisfaction (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) and daily perceived autonomous support. Furthermore, daily burnout reduced work-life balance and this was fully mediated by daily work-family conflict. In addition, daily engagement increased work-life balance and this was partially mediated by daily work-family enrichment. The implications for researching daily wellbeing of employees are discussed.

Keywords: work life balance; engagement; meaningful work; organising as process.

INTRODUCTION

Following the recent trend in positive psychology, scholars in the field of work and organizational psychology have become increasingly interested in employee's optimal functioning and positive experiences at work (Luthans & Avolio, 2009). Recent calls for understanding employee 'balance' suggest that balancing roles may be advantageous beyond established constructs of conflict and enrichment such as enhancing job satisfaction (Carlson, Grzywacz & Zivnuska, 2009). This study uses a daily dairy methodology to examine family-to-work and work-to-family processes on a daily basis, and how these influence burnout, engagement and balance of employees. Bolger, Davis and Rafaeli (2003) argued that diary studies allow for more accurate measurement of emotional states, and how these states fluctuate over days, and more reliability towards actual experience.

WORK-LIFE BALANCE

Research on the work-family interface has included work-family conflict (e.g. Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) and work-family enrichment (e.g. Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), while attention towards work-life balance has been intermittent and varied. Kofodimos (1993) suggested that an individual's wellbeing is best served by living a balanced life. However, some studies have conceptualized balance as reducing employee conflict (Premeaux, Adkins & Mossholder, 2007), and thus fail to explore enrichment, while others have focused on conflict and enrichment (Frone, 2003), but ignored balance. Achieving a balanced life is a challenge due to a number of factors, including work hours, and associated burnout from these demands (Haar, 2006). Towards understanding employee wellbeing, Steger et al. (2008) asserted that obtaining behavior reports over extended periods of time is preferable to cross-sectional snapshots. Consequently, a daily diary method can provide insight into

the dynamics of behavior and wellbeing by focusing on whether certain activities are related for a given person on a given day (Kahneman, Krueger, Schkade, Schwartz, & Stone, 2004). Importantly, focusing on daily life experiences also helps avoid the biases common to retrospective or global judgments (Kahneman, 1999). Although daily diary studies have examined the dynamics between experiences and wellbeing (e.g., Nezlek & Plesko, 2003), few studies utilize a comprehensive daily process approach as the present study. See Figure 1 (Insert Figure 1 here).

THEORETICAL MODELS

Conservation of Resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989) examines how people mobilize their resources at work to enhance wellbeing and motivation. According to COR, people aim to gain resources, such as those social, psychological and/or organizational aspects of the job that (a) are functional in achieving work goals, (b) reduce job demands and associated costs (physiological and psychological), and (c) stimulate personal growth and development (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). COR asserts that stress occurs when resources are threatened or when individuals fail to gain resources after substantial investment in them. Thus, resources play a central role in motivational and wellbeing. Consequently, COR suggests that job resources assist employees to meet their goals and in turn, employees may become more committed and engaged in their job. Ultimately, COR theory suggests that people in stressful situation such as conflict are less successful in gaining resources, and can continue to lose their resources, resulting in a loss spiral (Hobfoll, 1989; 2002). Alternatively, employees in enriching situations are likely to gain even more resources and thus enjoy a gain spiral (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001).

WORK-FAMILY INTERFACE

The work-family literature recognises that the links between work-family conflict and job resources is under explored (Bakker, ten Brummelhuis, Prins & van der Heijden, 2011). Work-family conflict is a form of inter-role conflict whereby role pressures from the work and family domains are incompatible (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) and this represents the negative influence of these relationships. Importantly, these influences can originate in one domain and intrude into the other domain, leading to work-family conflict (WFC) and family-work conflict (FWC). Boyar and Mosley (2007) described this conflict as “the aggregate view of an individual’s perceptions of the interference between work

and family domains” (p.268), which relates to scarcity theory. Meta-analysis (e.g. Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux & Brinley, 2005) has conflict is detrimental on outcomes. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) defined work-family enrichment as “the extent to which experiences in one role improves the quality of life in the other role” (p.72). Positive experiences in one role may (e.g. family) may increase employees coping strategies, resulting in increased efficiency and work productivity, leading to enrichment in the workplace. Similar to conflict, these effects are bi-directional, leading to work-family enrichment (WFE) and family-work enrichment (FWE). In their meta-analysis, McNall, Nicklin and Masuda (2010) found enrichment was positively related to a wide range of outcomes including mental health. We argue that the work-family interface (conflict and enrichment) will influence outcomes and job resources in different directions and thus represent different positions in our theoretical model (see Figure 1). We now address the resources explored in the present study.

SDT RESOURCES

Bakker and Demerouti (2007) argued that a number of resources and demands tested in workplace studies may not be widely relevant, and we focus on dimensions of Self Determination Theory (SDT) as new resources to consider. SDT postulates that the enhancement of wellbeing is facilitated by the innate, human potential to seek opportunities and situations that satisfy the basic psychological needs for competence, relatedness and autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The *need for autonomy* is defined as an inherent desire to act with a sense of freedom, choice and volition, that is, to be the creator of one’s actions and to feel psychologically free from control and others expectations (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Autonomous individuals are able to exercise choice in activities and be able to participate, based on the expectations of the self rather than others. The *need for competence* represents the desire to feel capable, master the environment and to bring about desired outcomes (Deci & Ryan, 2000). It is prominent in the propensity to explore and manipulate the environment and to engage in challenging tasks to test and extend and challenge one’s skill. Finally, the *need for relatedness* is conceptualised as the inherent predisposition to feel connected to others. That is, to be a member of a group, and to have significant emotional ties, beyond mere attachment, to others (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Perceived autonomy support (PAS) is defined as a culture that promotes and provides choice, freedom and rationale and provides support for employee’s (Williams, Gagne, Ryan & Deci, 2002) in

a climate of relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2008). Deci, Connell, and Ryan (1989) suggested that how employees perceive feedback from managers can be viewed as either informational (supporting the needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness) or controlling (being pressured to think, feel or behave in a specific way). As such, SDT proposes that contexts can support the satisfaction of psychological needs and wellbeing (Gagne, 2003; Gagne, Ryan, & Bargmann, 2003), especially the workplace environment (Ryan & Deci, 2008; Sprietzer et. al., 2005).

Various studies have confirmed the positive consequences of the satisfaction of the basic psychological needs (Deci & Ryan, 2000) including increased wellbeing (Sheldon, Ryan & Reis, 1996) and positive affect (Sheldon, Elliot, Kim, & Kasser, 2001). Similarly, research suggests that PAS facilitates relationship stability and wellbeing (Blais, Sabourin, Boucher & Vallerand, 1990; Knee, Lonsbary, Canevello, & Patrick, 2005) and has been related to wellbeing in multiple international samples (Baard, Deci & Ryan, 2004; Arshadi, 2010; Hagger, Chatzisarantis, Barkoukis, Wang, & Baranowski, 2005). This study focuses upon job burnout and work engagement.

JOB OUTCOMES

Job burnout is a “chronic state of physical and emotional depletion that results from excessive job demands and continuous hassles” (Wright & Cropanzano, 1998, p. 489). It entails the sentiment of being emotionally overextended and fatigued by your individual duties. Maslach and Leiter (1997) defined the antithesis of burnout as engagement. Bakker and Demerouti (2008) stated that workers who have higher work engagement have higher levels of energy, greater enthusiasm about their work and more self-efficacy. Thus, while job burnout is negative and detrimental, work engagement can be positive and constructive.

Job burnout it is thought to be a negative result of the interactions between person and work situation (Budak & Sürgevil, 2005; Singh, Goolsby & Rhoads, 1994) leading to an unproductive and unhappy workforce (Blau, Tatum & Ward-Cook, 2003; Maslach & Goldberg, 1998). Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) suggested that job demands and job resources can also influence work engagement. Job burnout has been linked to a number of outcomes including organizational commitment, job performance and OCBs (Cropanzano, Rupp & Byrne, 2003). As such, we argue that job burnout may mediate the influence of SDT factors and be directly related to employee wellbeing. Similarly, work

engagement has been found to mediate the influence of individual characteristics, job demands and job resources on job performance and OCBs (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004; Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006). We argue the SDT resources will decrease job burnout and increase work engagement, while job burnout in turn will reduce, while work engagement enhances, work-life balance. Following Figure 1, we suggest the work-family factors will play a mediating role on between these workplace outcomes and balance. Thus, at the end of our model, WFC and WFE will influence daily work-life balance directly, mediating the influence of job burnout and work engagement. This represents the loss and gain process of work to family dimensions, with WFC leading to lower and WFE to greater work-life balance. It also completes the process model.

Hypotheses

At the start of our model, we suggest family to work dimensions (conflict and enrichment) will have a direct effect on employee SDT job resources. As these SDT dimensions relate specifically to the workplace, we argue only family-work dimensions will directly influence these. As such, problems and issues in the home will deplete these resources, while enhancements and benefits originating in the home will increase them. We argue FWC creates a loss process while FWE creates a gain process, aligned with COR (Hobfoll, 1989, 2002; Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001). Furthermore, the direct positive effects of SDT resources (autonomy, competence, relatedness and PAS) will provide a resource that will be negatively related to job burnout and positively related to work engagement. *Hypothesis 1: High levels of daily FWC will be positively related to daily feelings of job burnout, through reduced daily job resources. Hypothesis 2: High levels of daily FWE will be positively related to daily feelings of work engagement, through enhanced daily job resources.*

Furthermore, we suggest job burnout will reduce and work engagement increase, the work-life balance of employees. However, we argue these factors will be further influenced (mediated) by the role of WFC and WFE. This further supports the COR approach of the loss and gain spiral, and extends the work-family literature by including work-family conflict and enrichment into our daily process model. *Hypothesis 3: High levels of daily job burnout will be negatively related to daily work-life balance, through increased daily WFC. Hypothesis 4: High levels of daily work engagement will be positively related to daily work-life balance, through increased daily WFE.*

METHOD

Data were collected from 200 small businesses and 200 organizations, within a wide regional location in New Zealand, amongst a broad range of industries and sectors. An initial survey was distributed (trait variables) and at the beginning of the next full week, respondents were provided with a survey to be completed in four consecutive days at the end of the day (work-family, SDT and outcome variables). In total, 113 respondents completed all four consecutive days and the initial survey. Participants were 52% were managers and there was no significant difference with owners. Respondents averaged 39.8 years of age, with 56% male, 73% married and 66% parents and a wide spread of education and industry.

Measures

For all daily diary measures, the range of Cronbach's alpha for all measures was $> .70$, and all items included an additional stem "Today..." to address the focus specifically to the day reported. The three needs satisfaction was measured on a daily basis using 3-items by Deci, Ryan, Gagné, Leone, Usunov and Kornazheva (2001), coded 1=not at all true, 5=very true. This measure has been widely used and validated (e.g. Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009). Questions followed the stem "How important is the following to you..." and items were spread (three each) amongst the three needs. Autonomy, sample item "The tasks I did at work were in line with what I really wanted to do", Competence, sample item "I really master my tasks at my job" and Relatedness, sample item "At work, I talked with people about things that really matter to me". PAS was measured by 3-items by Baard et al. (2004), coded 1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree. A sample item is "I was provided with choices and options".

All work-family interface items were coded 1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree. WFC and FWC were measured using 6-items from Carlson, Kacmar and Williams (2000). The statements were divided equally (3 each) between work-family and family-work dimensions. Sample items are "Due to all the pressures at work, I came home too stressed to do the things I enjoy" (WFC) and "Due to stress at home, I am often preoccupied with family matters at work" (FWC). WFE and FWE were measured using 6-items from Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne and Grzywacz. (2006). The statements divided equally (3 each) between work-family and family-work dimensions, following the stems "My involvement in my work..." and "My involvement in my family...". Sample items are "Puts me in a

good mood and this helps me be a better family member” (WFE) and “Made me feel happy and this helped me be a better worker” (FWE). Work-Life Balance was measured with 3-items by Haar (2010): “Nowadays, I seem to enjoy every part of my life equally well”, “I am satisfied with my work-life balance, enjoying both roles”, and “I manage to balance the demands of my work and personal/family life well”. Factor analysis was conducted (principal components, varimax rotation), which confirmed the 3-items loaded onto a single factor with an eigenvalues greater than 1 (2.150), accounting for sizeable amounts of the variance (71.7), and having adequate reliability ($\alpha = .74-.84$).

Job Burnout was measured using 6-items from Maslach and Jackson (1981), coded 1=totally disagree, 5= totally agree. We combined emotional exhaustion and cynicism dimensions. Sample item “I felt emotionally drained from my work”. Work Engagement was measured using 9-items from Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma and Bakker (2001), coded 1=totally disagree, 5= totally agree. Sample item “At my work, I felt bursting with energy”.

Controls: We controlled for a number of demographic variables including Gender (1=female, 0=male), Age (years), and Work Hours (per week). We also controlled for trait burnout (10-items) and trait engagement (17-items), using the same dimensions as for the daily measures (noted above). We did not control for position (manager versus business owner) since these were not significant in any model, and were thus excluded.

Analysis

Our repeated measures data can be viewed as multi-level data, with repeated measurements nested within individuals. This leads to a two-level model with the repeated measures (4 days) at the first-level ($n = 524$ study occasions) and the individual persons at the second-level ($n = 131$ participants). Multi-level analysis with the MlwiN program (Rashbash, Browne, Healy, Cameron, & Charlton, 2000) was applied. Predictor variables at the day-level (Level 1, i.e. FWC) were centred to the individual mean and person-level (Level 2) predictor variables (i.e. age) were centred to the grand mean. In order to test mediated relationship in multilevel models, we followed the Monte Carlo Method for assessing mediation as described by Bauer, Preacher, and Gil (2006). For each mediated effect we calculated the distribution of the mediation effect using the estimate and the standard error of the effect of the predictor (x) on the mediator (m), as well as the estimate and the standard error of

m on the outcome variable (y). The 0 hypothesis that m does not significantly mediate the relationship between x and y is rejected when the distribution of possible estimates for m lies above or below zero.

RESULTS (direct effects reported only)

In order to test mediation effects of FWC on burnout through the four job resources, we first tested whether FWC significantly predicted daily autonomy, competence, relatedness and support (see **Table 1, Part A**). In line with our predictions, FWC was significantly, negatively, related to autonomy (estimate = $-.20$, SE = $.04$, $p < .001$), competence (estimate = $-.22$, SE = $.04$, $p < .001$), relatedness (estimate = $-.13$, SE = $.04$, $p < .001$), and support (estimate = $-.22$, SE = $.04$, $p < .001$). In a second step we tested the main effect of daily FWC on daily burnout. The Main model showed that the direct effect of FWC on work related burnout was significant and positive (estimate = $.39$, SE = $.05$, $p < .001$). In a third step, we tested for mediation, adding the variables autonomy, competence, relatedness and support.

The results of the Mediation model (third column) indicated that only autonomy was significantly, negatively, related to burnout. When adding the mediators, the estimate of the main effect of FWC on burnout dropped, although it was still significant. This is an indication that autonomy partially mediates the relationship between FWC and burnout. The Monte Carlo Method showed that the distribution interval of the indirect effect through autonomy was above zero at a 95% confidence interval (lower level (LL) = $.02$, upper level (UP) = $.09$, $p < .05$). Hypothesis 1 was thus partially supported. More specifically, the relationship between FWC and job burnout is mediated by autonomy. The job resources competence, relatedness and support did not mediate the relationship between FWC and burnout.

Hypothesis 2 was also tested in three steps (see **Table 1, Part B**). First, we found that FWE was significantly, positively related to autonomy (estimate = $.21$, SE = $.04$, $p < .001$), competence (estimate = $.27$, SE = $.04$, $p < .001$), relatedness (estimate = $.14$, SE = $.04$, $p < .001$), and support (estimate = $.27$, SE = $.04$, $p < .001$). Second, the Table shows the result testing the relationship between FWE and work engagement. As can be seen from the Main model, we found a significant positive effect of FWE on engagement. Third, the Mediation Model (third column) showed that the all four mediator variables were significantly, positively, related to engagement. The estimate of the

relationship between FWE and engagement dropped when adding the job resources, suggesting that those mediate the relationship between FWE and engagement. The Monte Carlo test confirmed that autonomy (LL = .002, UL = .005, $p < .05$), competence (LL = .002, UL = .08, $p < .05$), relatedness (LL = .004, UL = .03, $p < .05$) and support (LL = .04, UL = .11, $p < .05$), significantly mediated the relationship between FWE and engagement. Hypothesis 2 was thus supported. More specifically, we found that FWE was positively related to work engagement through enhanced autonomy, competence, relatedness and support at work.

Hypothesis 3 tested the loss pathway from work to family (see **Table 2, Part A**). We found that burnout was significantly, positively related to the mediator WFC (estimate = .58, SE = 0.05, $p < .001$). The Table provides the results of the second step of the mediation analysis. The Main model shows that daily burnout is significantly, negatively related to WLB. When adding the mediator WFC, this main effect disappears, while WFC is a significant, negative, predictor of WLB (Mediation Model). The Monte Carlo test also confirms that the relationship between burnout and WLB through WFC represents significant mediation (LL = -0.16, UL = -0.06, $p < .05$). Thus, our results supported Hypothesis 3 that daily feelings of burnout decrease daily WLB through enhanced daily WFC.

Hypothesis 4 predicted a gain pathway from work to family (see **Table 2, Part B**). We found that daily work engagement significantly enhanced daily WFE (estimate = 0.41, SE = .06 $p < .001$). The main effect of work engagement on WLB was, as predicted, significant and positive. The mediation model shows that the estimate of this main model drops when adding the mediator variable WFE. WFE significantly mediated the relationship between engagement and WLB, as confirmed by the Monte Carlo test (LL = 0.05, UL = 0.14, $p < .05$). This result supports Hypothesis 4 that daily feelings of work engagement increase daily WLB through enhanced daily WFE.

DISCUSSION

The present study sought to explore the daily work-life balance of employees through a daily process model. While the work-family literature often explores associated dimensions bi-directionally, the present study argued this may be a limitation as some factors are likely to be more relevant and important at different times of the day rather than at the same time. Consequently, the present study builds on the strengths of daily diary studies (Bolger et al., 2003), and applied the work-family and

family-work dimensions of conflict and enrichment through a daily process model. We argued and found that family-work dimensions were most likely to influence job resources, as these at home dimensions are capable of entering the workplace and either eroding (conflict) or building (enrichment) job resources. The present study also expanded the types of job resources explored in the literature by testing SDT dimensions of autonomy, competence, relatedness and support. Furthermore, while family-work dimensions were likely to influence burnout and engagement, we argued and found this would likely to be through job resources, with these resources mediating the influence of family-work dimensions on job outcomes.

Our analysis provided support for a mediated model where FWC influenced burnout through job resources. Additional analysis (not shown) showed that FWC did reduce the job resource of autonomy, indicating that conflict originating in the home and entering the workplace leads to a reduction of autonomy satisfaction, which in turn influences job burnout. While the job resource of autonomy did reduce job burnout, its effectiveness is reduced through the influence of FWC. Thus, conflict at home entering the workplace reduces feelings of autonomy which may be useful for offsetting feelings of job exhaustion and cynicism. Our analysis also provided support for a mediated model where FWE influenced engagement through job resources. Additional analysis (not shown) showed that FWE did enhance all the job resources of autonomy, competence, relatedness and support, indicating that enrichment originating in the home and entering the workplace leads to an increase of all three needs satisfactions and support, which in turn influences work engagement. While all job resources did enhance work engagement, its effectiveness is further enhanced through the positive influence of FWE.

Similarly, our second set of models also provides support for a mediated model where burnout reduced work-life balance through WFC. Additional analysis (not shown) showed that job burnout did increase WFC, indicating that an employee feeling emotionally exhausted and burnout leads to greater feelings of conflict originating in the workplace and then entering the home, and ultimately leading to a reduction in work-life balance perceptions. In addition, this model showed that WFC fully mediated the influence of job burnout on work-life balance, providing strong empirical support for our daily process model of mediated effects. Our analysis also provided support for a

mediated model where work engagement influenced work-life balance through WFE. Additional analysis (not shown) showed that work engagement did increase WFE, indicating that an employee feeling engaged and vigorous during the day leads to greater feelings of enrichment originating in the workplace, and when this then enters the home it ultimately leads to increased work-life balance perceptions. However, unlike the job burnout-WFC-work-life balance relationship, work engagements influence on work-life balance was only partially mediated by WFE.

Overall, this study makes a number of contributions. Relating to the process model, there appears strong support for family-work and work-family dimensions interacting at different levels within a day, although methodologically, this is uniquely limited to daily diary level studies. Most cross-sectional surveys will not be able to apply such a detailed level of analysis, but clearly there are implications for work-family researchers and how they analyze the influence of different work-family dimensions on outcomes. The present study provides strong support for a process model of effects, and we encourage other researchers to utilize a similar methodology with daily diary studies to confirm the process found here and to further enhance our understanding of how the work-family interface, job resources, job outcomes and work-life balance can be tested. Theoretically, this suggests that the work-family interface can be both positive and negative, along the enrichment and conflict theoretical approaches, but also that within a single day, can be aligned with entering the workforce and the home. This conceptualization and application of the work-family interface also has implications.

Researchers may seek to test the applicability of work-family interventions at a daily level to provide greater understanding of optimal time placement, application and performance of work-family practices, which have been argued as being beneficial for reducing conflict (Haar & Spell, 2004). For example, tailoring work-family practices that allow employees to access them within a day, may allow them to create to challenges and demands that occur without warning. Our findings also encourage organizations and HR departments to consider other forms of support (e.g. supervisor, organizational) can be best applied to have the strongest effect on employees.

Limitations

As with all research, there are some limitations that need to be acknowledged. In particular, our sample of managers and business owners is a sample that may not readily generalize to the wider employed population. Furthermore, future studies might seek to collect data at appropriate time frames, for example family-work dimensions at the start of the working day and work-family dimensions at the end of the work day, with work-life balance at the very end of the day. However, this would ultimately place heavy demands on respondents and thus create an additional challenge for researchers. Similar to other daily diary studies (e.g. Steger et al., 2008) our data is still self-reported and as such could be improved through observational data (e.g. daily family satisfaction by a partner). Despite these limitations, our sample was well spread with regard to gender, education, and industry sector, and respondents were drawn from a wide range of professions. Finally, while there were some issues with regard to the reliability scores for two of the needs satisfaction measures, it is not uncommon for daily diary studies to report measures used with less than optimal reliabilities (e.g. Song, Foo & Uy, 2008; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2009; Binnewies, Sonnentag & Mojza, 2010). Consequently, while there is some concern towards the relatedness dimension, this type of limitation is not uncommon and given its minor role (only related to the FWE model), it is unlikely to have resulted in erroneous results.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the present study makes a number of contributions, paramount being the daily process model and how family-work and work-family dimensions of both conflict and enrichment interact with burnout and engagement outcomes and influence work-life balance through work-family conflict and enrichment. The daily diary methodology allows us to process the work-family dimensions throughout the day and provides strong support for the effects of work-family and family-work conflict and enrichment towards work-life balance, working through SDT job resources and job outcomes of burnout and engagement.

REFERENCES

- Aryee, S., Srinivas, E. S., & Tan, H. H. (2005). Rhythms of life: Antecedents and outcomes of work–family balance in employed parents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 132-146.
- Arshadi, N. (2010). Basic need satisfaction, work motivation, and job performance in an industrial company in Iran. *Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 5, 1267-1272.
- Baard, P., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2004). Intrinsic need satisfaction: A motivational basis of performance and well-being in two work settings. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 2045–2068.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E. & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands: Resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43, 83-104.
- Bakker, A. B. & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22, 309–328.
- Bakker, A. B. & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work Engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223.
- Bakker, A. B., ten Brummelhuis, L. L., Prins, J. T. & der Heijden, F. M. M. A. (2011). Applying the job demands – resources model to the work-home interface: A study among medical residents and their partners. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79, 170- 180.
- Bauer, D. J., Preacher, K. J. & Gil, K. M. (2006). Conceptualizing and testing random indirect effects and moderated mediation in multilevel models: New procedures and recommendations. *Psychological Methods*, 11(2), 142–163.
- Binnewies, C., Sonnentag, S. & Mojza, E. J. (2010). Recovery during the weekend and fluctuations in weekly job performance: A week-level study examining intra- individual relationships. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83, 419–441.
- Blau, G., Tatum, D., & Ward-Cook, K. (2003). Correlates of work exhaustion for medical technologists. *Journal of Allied Health*, 32(3), 148-157
- Blais, M. R., Sabourin, S., Boucher, C., & Vallerand, R. J. (1990). Toward a motivational model of couple happiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1021–1031.

- Bolger, N., Davis, A. & Rafaeli, E. (2003). Diary methods: capturing life as it is lived. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 579–616.
- Boyar, S. L., & Mosley Jr., D. C. (2007). The relationship between core self- evaluations and work and family satisfaction: The mediating role of work- family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 71(2), 265-281.
- Budak, G. & Sürgevil, O. (2005). Tükenmislik ve tükenmisliği etkileyen örgütsel faktörlerin analize ilişkin akademik personel üzerinde bir uygulama. D.E.Ü. İİBF. *Dergisi*, 20(2), 95-108.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and Initial Validation of a Multidimensional Measure of Work–Family Conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56, 249–276.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Wayne, J. H., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2006). Measuring the positive side of the work-family interface: development and validation of a work- family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(1), 131-164.
- Carlson, D. S., Grzywacz, J. G. & Zivnuska, S. (2009). Is work–family balance more than conflict and enrichment? *Human Relations*, 62(10), 1459–1486.
- Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., & Byrne, Z. S. (2003). The relationship of emotional exhaustion to work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 160-169.
- Cullen, J., Silverstein, B., & Foley, M. (2008). Linking biomechanical workload and organizational practices to burnout and satisfaction. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 23, 63-71
- Deci, E. L., Connell, J. E., & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Self determination in a work organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(4), 580-590.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-268.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being *Canadian Psychology*, 49(1), 14-23.

- Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., Gagné, M., Leone, D. R., Usunov, J., & Kornazheva, B. P. (2001). Need satisfaction, motivation, and well-being in the work organizations of a former Eastern Bloc country. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(8), 930-942.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F. & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 499-512.
- Eby, L., Casper, W., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980–2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(1), 124–197.
- Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-Family Balance. In J. C. Quick and L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology* (pp. 143–162). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Gagne, M. (2003). The role of autonomy support and autonomy orientation in prosocial behavior engagement. *Motivation and Emotion*, 27(3), 199–223.
- Gagne, M., Ryan, R. M., & Bargmann, K. (2003). Autonomy support and need satisfaction in the motivation and well-being of gymnasts. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 15, 372–390.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76-88.
- Greenhaus, J. H. & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 72-92.
- Greguras, G. J. & Diefendorff, J. M. (2009). Different fits satisfy different needs: Linking person-environment fit to employee commitment and performance using self-determination theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 465–477.
- Haar, J. & Spell, C. (2004). Program knowledge and value of work-family practices and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15(6), 1040-1055.
- Haar, J. M. (2006). The downside of coping: work-family conflict, employee burnout and the moderating effects of coping strategies. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 12(2), 146-159.

- Haar, J. (2010). Exploring work-life harmony on well-being: A study of single and married employees. *2nd Australian Positive Psychology and Well-being Conference 2010*, Melbourne, Australia, 12-13 February 2010.
- Hagger, M. S., Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., Barkoukis, V., Wang, C. K. J. & Baranowski, J. (2005). Perceived autonomy support in physical education and leisure-time physical activity: A cross-cultural evaluation of the trans-contextual model. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(3), 376-390.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44, 513-524.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2002). Social and psychological resources and adaptation. *Review of General Psychology*, 6, 307-324.
- Hobfoll, S. E. & Shirom, A. (2001). Conservation of resources theory: Applications to stress and management in the workplace. In: Golembiewski, R. T. (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Behavior*, (pp. 57-81), New York: Dekker.
- Kahneman, D. (1999). Objective happiness. In, D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwartz (Eds.), *Well-Being: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology* (pp. 3-25). New York: Russell Sage.
- Kahneman, D., Krueger, A. B., Schkade, D. A., Schwartz, N., & Stone, A. A. (2004). A survey method for characterizing daily life experience: The Day Reconstruction Method. *Science*, 306, 1776-1780.
- Knee, C. R., Lonsbary, C., Canevello, A., & Patrick, H. (2005). Self-determination and conflict in romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(6), 997-1009.
- Kofodimos, J. R. (1993). *Balancing Act*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Luthans, F. & Avolio, B. J. (2009). The 'point' of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(2), 291-307.
- McNall, L. A., Nicklin, J. M. & Masuda, A. D. (2010). A meta-analytic review of the consequences associated with work-family enrichment. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25, 381-396.

- Maslach, C. & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 2, 99-113.
- Maslach, C. & Goldberg, J. (1998). Prevention of burnout: new perspectives. *Applied and Preventative Psychology*, 7(1) 63-74.
- Maslach, C. & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *The Truth about Burnout*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. McGraw-Hill: New York.
- Nezlek, J. B., & Plesko, R. M. (2003). Affect- and self-based models of relationships between daily events and daily well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 584–596.
- Perrons, D. (2003). The new economy and the work-life balance: Conceptual explorations and a case study of new media. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 10, 65-93.
- Premeaux, S. F., Adkins, C. L. & Mossholder, K. W. (2007). Balancing work and family: A field study of multi-dimensional, multi-role work-family conflict. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28, 705–727.
- Rashbash, J., Browne, W., Healy, M., Cameron, B., & Charlton, C. (2000). MLwiN (Version 1.10.006): *Interactive Software for Multilevel Analysis*. London: Multilevel Models Project, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Reich, R. (2001). *The Future of Success: Work and Life in the New Economy*. London: Heinemann.
- Reis, H. T., Sheldon, K. M., Gable, S. L., Roscoe, J., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). Daily well-being: The role of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 419–435.
- Richardsen, A. M., Burke, R. J. & Martinussen, M. (2006). Work and health outcomes among police officers: The mediating role of police cynicism and engagement. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 13(4), 555-574.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V. & Bakker, A. B. (2001). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71–92.

- 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, 293–315.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B. & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a brief questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 701-716.
- Sheldon, K. M., Elliot, A. J., Kim, Y., & Kasser, T. (2001). What is satisfying about satisfying events? Testing 10 candidate psychological needs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 325–339.
- Sheldon, K. M., Ryan, R., & Reis, H. T. (1996). What makes for a good day? Competence and autonomy in the day of a person. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(12), 1280-1288.
- Singh, J., Goolsby, J. R., & Rhoads, G. K. (1994). Behavioral and psychological consequences of boundary spanning burnout for customer service representatives. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 33, 558–569.
- Song, Z., Foo, M. & Uy, M. A. (2008). Mood spillover and crossover among dual-earner couples: A cell phone event sampling study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 443–452.
- Steger, M. F., Kashdan, T. B. & Oishi, S. (2008). Being good by doing good: Daily eudaimonic activity and well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42, 22–42.
- Valcour, M. (2007). Work-based resources as moderators of the relationship between work hours and satisfaction with work–family balance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1512–1523.
- Williams, G. C., Gagne, M., Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2002). Facilitating autonomous motivation for smoking cessation. *Health Psychology*, 21, 40–50.
- Wright, T. A. & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Emotional exhaustion as a predictor of job performance and voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(3), 486-493.

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E. & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82, 183–200.

Table 1. Multilevel Results of the Mediated Family-to-Work Relationship

Part A. FWC on Burnout through Job Resources							Part B. FWE on Engagement through Job Resources					
Null model		Main model		Mediation model			Null model		Main model		Mediation model	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Intercept	2.37***	0.06	2.39***	0.08	2.39	0.08***	3.28***	0.04	3.27***	0.04	3.27***	0.06
Gender (female)			-0.04	0.12	-0.04	0.12			0.03	0.09	0.03	0.09
Age			-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01**			0.00	0.00	0.00**	0.00
Work hours			0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01			0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00
Trait Burnout			0.58***	0.07	0.58	0.07***			--	--	--	--
Trait Engagement			--	--	--	--			0.43***	0.05	0.43***	0.05
Daily Measures:												
FWC			0.39***	0.05	0.30	0.05***			--	--	--	--
FWE			--	--	--	--			0.27***	0.04	0.12**	0.04
Autonomy					-0.26	0.07***					0.11*	0.05
Competence					-0.09	0.07					0.17***	0.05
Relatedness					0.04	0.06					0.12**	0.04
Support					-0.11	0.07					0.26***	0.05
Variance level 1 (employee)	0.34 46%)	0.06	0.32	0.05	0.33	0.05	0.17 (43%)	0.03	0.17	0.03	0.11	0.02
Variance level 2 (day)	0.40 54%)	0.03	0.35	0.03	0.32	0.02	0.23 (57%)	0.02	0.21	0.02	0.17	0.01
-2 Log likelihood	1200.09		1134.25		1097.66		905.64		857.08		703.89	

Note. *** p < .001, ** p < .01. N = 131 participants, N = 524 occasions. SE = standard estimate.

Table 2. Multilevel Results of the Mediated Work-to-Family Relationship

<i>Part A. Burnout on Work-Life Balance through WFC</i>							<i>Part B. Engagement on Work-Life Balance through WFE</i>					
Null model		Main model		Mediation model			Null model		Main model		Mediation model	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Intercept	3.49***	0.06	3.41***	0.08	3.41***	0.08	3.49***	0.06	3.41***	0.08	3.41***	0.08
Gender (female)			0.18	0.12	0.18	0.12			0.18	0.12	0.18	0.12
Age			0.02**	0.01	0.02**	0.01			0.02**	0.01	0.02**	0.01
Work hours			-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01			-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01
Trait Burnout			-0.15***	0.04	-0.04	0.05			--	--	--	--
Trait Engagement			--	--	--	--			0.23***	0.06	0.14**	0.06
Daily Measures:												
WFC					-0.19***	0.04					--	--
WFE					--	--					0.22***	0.05
Variance level 1 (employee)	0.38 (55%)	0.06	0.33	0.05	0.33	0.05	0.38 (55%)	0.06	0.33	0.05	0.33	0.05
Variance level 2 (day)	0.31 (45%)	0.02	0.30	0.02	0.29	0.02	0.31 (45%)	0.02	0.30	0.02	0.28	0.02
-2 Log likelihood	1102.69		1075.57		1056.22		1102.69		1071.05		1051.62	

Note. *** p < .001, ** p < .01. N = 131 participants, N = 524 occasions. SE = standard estimate.

Figure 1. Hypothesized Daily Reciprocal Processes between Family and Work

