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ABSTRACT: Work-family enrichment has emerged as a new way to explore the work-family interface, but studies on life satisfaction are rare. Using a sample of 399 NZ employees we explore job autonomy towards enrichment and life satisfaction. We conducted a multi-group analysis to test for gender differences. Overall, the influence of job autonomy was significantly related to life satisfaction for both genders, and also towards enrichment dimensions. Work-family enrichment capital predicted life satisfaction for both genders, while family-work affect was significant only for women. Overall, females had links across both the work and family domains towards life satisfaction while men were influenced only by work domains. The implications for research and the role of gender on these relationships are discussed.
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Introduction. More recently researchers have begun addressing the unequal focus of work-family research by delving into the positive or enriching aspects of work and family roles (Carlson, Hunter, Ferguson, & Whitten, 2014; Haar & Bardoel, 2008; Grzywacz, Carlson, Kacmar & Wayne, 2007). The concept of work-family enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) has gained significance with researchers due to its robust theoretical framework with Grzywacz et al. (2007) recommended that work-family enrichment should be used for understanding individual-level role interactions. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) provided the theoretical foundation for work family enrichment by systematically examining previous literature on the positive interactions between work and family roles, while this has been confirmed empirically (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne & Grzywacz, 2006). Life satisfaction is one outcome less explored in the literature, which is a critical gap because it is related to an impressive array of social, health and organizational outcomes (Erdogan, Bauer, Truxillo, & Mansfield, 2012). We extend the literature by also exploring the role of job autonomy as an antecedent of work-family enrichment and then we explore gender differences across these relationships. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) have stressed on the need for studies to examine the role of gender in work-family enrichment due to the inconsistent results of empirical studies.

Life Satisfaction. Life satisfaction is the satisfaction associated with the various domains of ‘life’ (Cummins, 1996) and along with positive and negative affect is one of the significant indicators of subjective well-being (Diener & Emmons, 1984; Erdogan et al., 2012). Shin and Johnson (1978) suggest that life satisfaction is a judgmental process, where individuals assess their life quality based on a set of unique factors. In the broad definition of well-being, life satisfaction is referred to as the cognitive-judgmental component (Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, 1985). The cognitive
assessment of satisfaction with life is one key indicator of subjective wellbeing (Linley, Maltby, Wood, Osborne, & Hurling, 2009). The present study explores life satisfaction three ways: (1) job autonomy, to determine whether such freedom and control enhances satisfaction with life and work-family enrichment; (2) work-family enrichment, where the direct effects of enrichment are tested on life satisfaction; and finally, (3) exploring potential gender differences in the relationships noted above (1 and 2). These are now explored in the next section.

**Job Autonomy.** Haar and Spell (2009) stated that “A sense of autonomy and ability to use discretion over how someone does their job should convey a feeling of control over work” (p. 1831). With respect to job autonomy, the trust and freedom provided by the employer via job autonomy might lead an employee to reciprocate with greater job outcomes, such as Haar and Spell (2009) finding job autonomy directly related to job satisfaction (positively) and turnover intentions (negatively). A meta-analysis by Baltes, Briggs, Huff, Wright, and Neuman (1999) found aspects relating to job autonomy were related to a number of important job outcomes. Ng and Feldman (2015), surmised that individuals who hold jobs with high levels of autonomy are more likely to display more positive job attitudes, more positive job behaviors, and greater well-being.

**Work-Family Enrichment.** Early work on the interplay between work and family roles assumed they were universally incompatible, with the resulting discord leading to work-family conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux and Brinley (2005) showed that most studies on work-family dynamics focused on the negative effects and a minority of studies focussed exclusively on the positive or favourable effects (such as work-family enrichment), which have been called the ‘neglected side’ (Stevens, Minotte, Mannon, & Kiger, 2007) of the work family interface. More recently attention has been given to the antecedents and outcomes, presented in meta-analyses and reviews (Crain & Hammer, 2013; McNall, Nicklin, & Masuda, 2010; Michel, Clark & Jaramillo, 2011). Role enhancement (Sieber, 1974) and expansion (Marks, 1977) provide the theoretical background for enrichment by proposing that participation in multiple roles can lead to increases of resources and energy and in turn, well-being. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) developed a systematic theoretical model for understanding positive work and family linkages utilizing the concept of enrichment. They defined work-family enrichment as “the extent to which experiences in one role
improve the quality of life in the other role” (p. 73). This enhancement in the quality of life occurs as a consequence of the resource gains from the other role. Carlson et al. (2006) suggested that even though researchers have used the constructs related to positive work-family linkages interchangeably (e.g. positive spillover, Haar & Bardoel, 2008), work-family enrichment was significantly different because enrichment can be construed as having occurred not only when resources generated in a role have been transferred to the other role, but the transference of resources should also result in improved functioning in the other role.

Work-family enrichment is a bi-directional construct with enrichment occurring in the workplace and entering the home (work-family enrichment, WFE) or alternatively, occurring in the home and entering the workplace (family-work enrichment, FWE). Each direction has three sub-dimensions, which are: (1) Development, when participation in a role results in increases or improvement of skills, knowledge, and behaviours etc. and (2) Affect, which is the positive emotional state (mood) achieved through involvement with a role assisting performance. These two sub-dimensions occur in both WFE and FWE. (3) Capital is WFE specific and occurs when levels of psycho-social resources like sense of security, confidence, accomplishment etc. are increased by taking part in activities at work, while Efficiency is FWE specific and occurs when an individual develops a sense of focus and efficiency by participating in the family role. The benefits of work-family enrichment occur through the (1) instrumental path or (2) affective path. Instrumental path involves a direct improvement of performance in the other role (e.g., Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer & King, 2002); while the affective path involves the creation of positive affect (moods and emotions) from one role, which enhances performance in the other role (e.g., Rothbard, 2001). Overall, there is strong empirical research linking WFE and FWE towards a number of outcomes (McNall, Nicklin, & Masuda, 2010) highlighting the importance of enrichment towards enhanced employee lives.

**Hypotheses.** While there are many links between job autonomy and work outcomes (such as job satisfaction, Haar & Spell, 2009), there is theoretical justification for links between job autonomy and life satisfaction. Thompson and Prottas (2006) tested and found job autonomy was significantly linked to life satisfaction, suggested that “high levels of job autonomy, should enhance employees’ perceptions of control, which in turn should be related to…life satisfaction” (p. 104). Consequently,
towards well-being outcomes, this aligns more with social support (Thompson & Prottas, 2006), where Helgeson and Lopez (2010) suggested that support within the workplace can benefit an employees’ wellbeing. Thus, employees can have greater control over their work roles via job autonomy, which enhances their life satisfaction. Thus, we posit:

_Hypothesis 1: Job autonomy will be positively associated with life satisfaction._

The relationships between job autonomy and work-family enrichment are more established, with strong links between job autonomy enhancing the resources associated with both dimensions of work-family enrichment (WFE and FWE) as well as the multiple dimensions of enrichment. For example, Carlson et al. (2006) found job autonomy was positively related to all three WFE dimensions and two of the three FWE dimensions. Baral and Bhargava (2011) hypothesized that core job characteristics like job autonomy would enhance work-family enrichment, and they found support for both WFE and FWE across manager samples and employee samples (Baral & Bhargava, 2010, 2011). Consequently, we expect employees with higher job autonomy to generate higher WFE and FWE via freedom to manage work and non-work timetables. We posit the following.

_Hypotheses 2: Job autonomy will be positively associated with (a) WFE and (b) FWE._

Life satisfaction had also been frequently examined in relation to work-family conflict and has strong meta-analytical support (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998), leading to the conclusion that there exists a negative relationship between work-family conflict and life satisfaction. However, fewer studies have examined the relationship between positive work-family constructs and life satisfaction (e.g., Sumer & Knight, 2001; Hill, 2005). Garies, Barnett, Ertel and Berkman (2009) found both WFE and FWE were positively linked to life satisfaction in a large sample of US employees, and this has been supported in other US research (Schenewark & Dixon, 2012). Finally, the meta-analysis by McNall et al. (2010) exploring the outcomes of work-family enrichment, found a strong positive relation between WFE and life satisfaction but did not find one between life satisfaction and FWE due to the limited number of studies. The work of Carlson et al. (2006) who found support for all the enrichment dimensions (both WFE and FWE) being significantly linked to well-being and job satisfaction provides further support, and thus we expect the six dimensions to similarly be related to life satisfaction.
Hypothesis 3: (a) WFE and (b) FWE will be positively associated with life satisfaction.

**Gender Differences.** Many studies have focussed on gender differences in the work-family arena, especially with regard to work-family conflict. While some work-family studies have found no differences between genders (e.g., Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1997); other studies have found significant differences (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Haar & O’Driscoll, 2005). These differences apart, under social role theory, gender differences exist and are a function of differing societal expectations and thus social roles for women and men (Eagly, 1987). Societal expectations are such that men are expected to be the ‘provider’ and women, the ‘nurturer and caregiver’. Significant gender differences have been found by researchers examining the positive effects of work and family interactions (e.g., Haar & O’Driscoll, 2005; van Steenbergen, Ellemers & Mooijaart, 2007; Stevens et al., 2007).

McNall et al. (2010) meta-analysis on work-family enrichment found evidence of gender effects, and these showed that women reported higher levels of satisfaction from both WFE and FWE. They stated “We found that both WFE and FWE were more strongly related to job satisfaction and life satisfaction when the sample included a greater proportion of women” (p. 72), although they did argue that the small number of samples towards life satisfaction meant further replication was needed.

Neil and Snizek (1988) tested the influence of job autonomy by gender and found similar significant effects for both women and men. Kirmeyer and Shirom (1986) explored gender differences of perceived job autonomy, and found that men were more likely to perceive greater autonomy. Keene and Quadago (2004) found support for both gender similarities and gender differences (depending on the constructs explored), supporting the exploration of gender differences, while Pugliesi (1995) found a significant effect towards job satisfaction using a large sample of US employees. Keller, Meier, Gross, and Semmer (2015) suggested gender differences stating “it is possible that women judge their autonomy and skill variety as high in relation to other women; at the same time, they may be aware that men tend to have more of these characteristics, and that “male” occupations receive more social recognition” (p. 122).

Overall, this provides a useful gap in the literature to explore gender differences on job autonomy towards both life satisfaction and enrichment dimensions, given the existing support for direct effects on these constructs. Consequently, we hypothesize that women will report higher life
satisfaction at high levels of enrichment, across all dimensions, and similarly so when they report higher job autonomy. In addition, we argue that high job autonomy, given it is less likely to be common for women compared to men (e.g., Kirmeyer & Shirom, 1986), is likely to be a more valued resource by women and thus be leveraged towards enhanced WFE and FWE. This leads to our last set of hypotheses.

Hypotheses: Significant gender differences exist between (4) job autonomy and (a) WFE and (b) FWE, (5) job autonomy and life satisfaction, and (6) (a) WFE and (b) FWE towards life satisfaction, such that females will have stronger influences than men.

Our theoretical model is shown in Figure 1. <<INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE>>

Method. From 600 distributed surveys at 200 organizations, 399 responses were returned and physically collected by the RAs. Respondents ranged in age from 17 to 62 years, with an average age of 34.8 years (SD=12.4 years), with 55% female, 19% union members, 72% married, 52% parents, and an average family size of 1.7 dependents. By industry sector, 56% were in the private sector, 41% in the public sector and 3% in the not-for-profit sector.

Measures. Life Satisfaction was measured using the five item measure by Diener et al. (1985). This measure is well validated and established (Pavot & Diener, 2008). A sample item is “In most ways my life is close to ideal”, coded 1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree. This measure had a good internal reliability (α=.85). Job Autonomy was measured using three items by Knudsen, Johnson, Martin, and Roman (2003), coded 1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree. A sample question is “I have a lot of say over what happens on my job” (alpha=.78). Work-Family Enrichment was measured with 18-items by Carlson et al. (2006), coded 1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree. This measure has six dimensions, three towards work-family enrichment (WFE) and three towards family-work enrichment (FWE). Sub-categories, sample items, and reliabilities were as follows. Work-family items followed the stem “My involvement in my work…”. WFE Development, 3-items, sample “Helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me be a better family member” (α=.91), WFE Affect, 3-items, sample “Puts me in a good mood and this helps me be a better family member” (α=.94), and WFE Capital, 3-items, sample “Helps me feel personally fulfilled and this helps me be a better family member” (α=.92). Family-work items followed the stem “My involvement in my family…”. FWE
Development, 3-items, sample “Helps me acquire skills and this helps me be a better worker” ($\alpha = .88$), FWE Affect, 3-items, sample “Makes me feel happy and this helps me be a better worker” ($\alpha = .95$), and FWE Efficiency, 3-items, sample “Encourages me to use my work time in a focused manner and this helps me be a better worker” ($\alpha = .91$). We controlled for three variables typical of the work-family literature (Carlson et al., 2006): Total Hours Worked (regular contract hours plus typical overtime), Education (1=high school, 2=tech qualification, 3=bachelor’s, and 4=postgraduate), and Union Membership (1=yes, 0=no).

**Measurement Models.** To confirm the separate dimensions of the work-family and family-work enrichment measures, as well as job autonomy and life satisfaction, all items were tested by structural equation modeling (SEM) using AMOS v. 22. Following Williams, Vandenberg and Edwards (2009), we used the following measures to assess the CFA: (1) the comparative fit index (CFI $\geq .95$), (2) the root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA $\leq .08$), and (3) the standardized root mean residual (SRMR $\leq .10$). The measurement model did fit the data well for a seven-factor solution: $\chi^2$ (271) = 574.4 ($p = .000$), CFI = .96, RMSEA = 0.05, and SRMR = 0.03. To confirm the measurement model, we tested two alternative models, and our analysis confirmed that the hypothesized model was the best fit (see Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). Table 1 shows the measurement analysis. We also conducted multi-group analysis (CFA) to establish measurement invariance (Bou & Satorra, 2010) to ensure men and women respondents answered the survey items in the same way. This is important given we seek to test for differences across the sample. We followed the approach of Haar, Russo, Sune and Oliver-Malaterre (2014) where we compare the RMSEA between the men and women models. The RMSEA is preferred because this statistic is not affected by model complexity (Meade & Kroustalis, 2006). Across the two samples, the difference in RMSEA (constrained and unconstrained models) were very small at .001 (0.045 versus 0.044), which is below the Cheung and Renvold (2000) established critical value. Like Haar et al. (2014), this provides confidence that has metric invariance, and hence the sample of men and women respondents can be suitably compared.

**Analysis.** Hypotheses were tested using SEM in AMOS v. 22 to assess the direct effects of job autonomy on life satisfaction (Hypothesis 1) and on WFE and FWE (Hypothesis 2); the direct effects
of WFE and FWE on life satisfaction (Hypothesis 3), controlling for total hours worked, education and union membership. We test for potential gender differences on these relationships via a multi-group analysis.

**Results.** Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations for the study variables in the combined sample are shown in Table 2 (<insert table 2 about here>). Life satisfaction was significantly related to all enrichment dimensions (.34 < r > .15, all p< .01), as well as job autonomy (r= .34, p< .01). Similarly, the work-family and family-work enrichment dimensions are all significantly correlated with each other (all .74 < r > .26, all p< .01). Similarly, job autonomy is significantly correlated with all the enrichment dimensions (all .40 < r > .10, all p< .05). <insert table 3 about here>.

**Direct Effects.** Aligned with the recommendations of Grace and Bollen (2005), unstandardized regression coefficients are presented in Table 3 (path analysis results). Job autonomy is directly related to life satisfaction for men (path coefficient(pc) = .20, p < .05) and for women (pc = .31, p < .001), supporting Hypothesis 1. Job autonomy is also significantly related to the majority of enrichment dimensions, supporting Hypotheses 2a and 2b. For men, the path coefficients for the WFE dimensions were .22 (Development), .27 (Affect) and .40 (Capital), and were all p< .001. For women, the path coefficients for the WFE dimensions were .23 (Development), .46 (Affect) and .41 (Capital), and were all p< .001. For men, the path coefficients for the FWE dimensions were .17 (Development, p< .05), .10 (Affect, non-significant) and .15 (Efficiency, p< .05). For women, the path coefficients for the FWE dimensions were .07 (Development, non-significant), .12 (Affect, p< .05) and .21 (Efficiency, p< .001). There is also support for Hypotheses 3a with WFE Capital significantly related to life satisfaction for both men (pc = .35, p < .05) and women (pc = .32, p < .001). While no FWE dimension is significantly related for men, FWE Affect is for women (pc = .24, p < .05). Amongst the control variables, union membership is significantly related to life satisfaction for both men (pc = .36, p < .05), and women (pc = .26, p < .05), as well as WFE Development (v = .41, p < .01) and FWE Affect (pc = .34, p < .05) for men only. Also, hours worked is significantly and positively related to FWE Efficiency for men (v = .01, p < .05) and negatively to FWE Affect for women (v = -.01, p < .05). Finally, education is significantly related to FWE Efficiency for men (v = .12, p < .05).
Gender Differences. Hypothesis 4 suggested that women would experience greater benefit from job autonomy than men towards the various enrichment dimensions, and this was broadly supported for Hypothesis 4a, with greater path coefficients across all three of the WFE dimensions for women: .23>.22 (Development), .46>.27 (Affect) and .41>.40 (Capital), although especially prevalent for WFE affect. Hypothesis 4b is more mixed, as both men and women only had two significant paths amongst the three FWE dimensions, although women were overall stronger: .07<.17 (Development), .12>.10 (Affect) and .21>.15 (Efficiency). As such, this provides modest support for Hypothesis 4b. Hypothesis 5 suggested that women would experience greater benefit from job autonomy than men (due to its greater uniqueness), and comparing the strength of path coefficients, this was supported: .31 (p < .001)> .20 (p < .05). Hypothesis 6 suggested that women would have a greater influence on life satisfaction than men, and this was not supported for Hypothesis 6a, as both had similar scores from the same dimension (WFE Capital), which was the only significant predictor. However, strong support was found for Hypothesis 6b as women had a significant predictor from the FWE dimensions (Affect) while men had no significant predictors. Table 3 also shows that the multi-group (gender) structural models accounted for differing amounts of variance towards outcomes, especially life satisfaction, with the women model accounting for twice the variance of the men (r^2 = .36> r^2 = .18).

Discussion. The aim of this study was to investigate gender differences within the relationships between job autonomy, work-family enrichment and life satisfaction. Life satisfaction as a well-being dimension is an important outcome to explore given influences on work and performance outcomes. The present study suggested that job autonomy would be a significant predictor of work-family enrichment dimensions and life satisfaction and this was supported. The effects show that job autonomy provides resources that build employees WFE and FWE and this aligns with the notion that job autonomy provides control over work (Haar & Spell, 2009) that aids the construction of work resources (WFE). Importantly, these positive effects were consistent for both women and men towards WFE. Towards the family-work dimension, the effects were similar for both genders but different from the consistent WFE effects. Both groups were found to have positive effects between job autonomy on FWE Efficiency, which relates to a sense of focus and efficiency by participating in
the family role. However, men also reported a positive link between FWE Development (only) and women FWE Affect (only). So, while we find that job autonomy also provides resources for the family dimension (through allowing freedom and control to manage home and family roles) this might not function as uniformly as towards WFE dimensions. This might suggest that women and men use the control differently for example to build skills and knowledge for men but enhancing emotional states for women. Research has shown that women and men can utilize workplace control differently (e.g. Haar, 2007) so this might simply highlight the ways that autonomy provide differences to working women and men.

The other major focus of the present study was the exploration of the six dimensions of work-family enrichment towards life satisfaction. The present study provides methodological uniqueness by confirming the six enrichment dimensions determined by Carlson et al. (2006) and shows they are all significantly correlated to life satisfaction (see Table 2). However, the SEM analysis shows that only a few dimensions are significant predictors of life satisfaction. There is overwhelming support for WFE Capital as the prime predictor towards life satisfaction, with it being the only significant dimension across the three WFE dimensions, and the only significant predictor for men. WFE Capital is defined by Carlson et al. (2006) as “when involvement in work promotes levels of psychosocial resources such as a sense of security, confidence, accomplishment, or self-fulfillment that helps the individual to be a better family member” (p. 140). This suggests that the benefit of WFE Capital: through work providing security (permanent paid work), providing confidence and accomplishment (through doing a good job) provides such self-resources and confidences that ultimately lead such employees to report greater satisfaction with life. Indeed, the gender effect where this was the only dimension significant for men also reaffirms the gender roles around the importance of work for men. There are also gendered effects for women, as FWE Affect was also a significant predictor for women (along with WFE Capital). Carlson et al. (2006) defined FWE Affect as “when involvement in family results in a positive emotional state or attitude which helps the individual to be a better worker” (p. 140). So, the joy and positive mood associated with the family role is an important contributor to the life satisfaction of women, and this may be explained by the importance of the family roles for women who are also working. In this regard it might reflect the positive outcome of having happy family
relationships, with these positive moods affecting life satisfaction positively, over and above WFE benefits.

Combined, these empirical findings highlight some important gendered differences. While researchers have previously found that men report greater job autonomy that was not the case in the present study (t-test = -1.244, p = .214), and indeed, the present findings suggest that women (who reported equal levels of job autonomy as men) had stronger influences on enrichment dimensions and life satisfaction overall. Previous studies have suggested that and found that men have greater job autonomy (Kirmeyer & Shirom, 1986) but that might reflect a different era given it was 30 years ago. Perhaps workplaces are more egalitarian and provide job autonomy more frequently for all employees, and it is the gendered challenge for women to be trying to balance their work roles with the work as (still being) in the dominant family care role, that enables women to benefit more than men from greater autonomy due to complexity of roles being controlled and thus managed via job autonomy. The gender differences between enrichment and life satisfaction were more clear-cut than job autonomy, with only women reporting a significant relationship from a FWE dimension, despite all dimensions being positively correlated. This likely reflects the dominance of the work role for me, and highlights the potential benefits for working women, who enjoyed significant predictors from both enrichment dimensions (WFE and FWE). Post-hoc analysis (results not shown) on the six dimensions’ highlights that women have five scores significantly higher than men (all FWE dimension, plus WFE Development and Capital) indicating that the benefits of work and family might be greater for women than men. Thus, while the family roles are inherently enriching for women, this also extends into the work domain – perhaps reflecting the positive benefits for work for women, through building greater skills and psychosocial resources. This reaffirms researchers have suggested that the work domain is resource rich, with numerous types of resources (economic resources, social resources and psychological resources) that can enable enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Grzywacz et al., 2007). These findings also align with Rothbard (2001), who suggested men segment their roles to a higher degree than women as a ‘coping response’ to this work overload. However, working women may not be able to segment their work and family roles due to as the additional
family role responsibilities, and in this respect, they may gain greater enrichment from all these intertwined roles.

Implications for Future Research. The present study is one of the few to conduct multi-group analysis (by gender) on outcomes of work-family enrichment. Given that significant gender differences were found in particular between FWE dimensions and life satisfaction, we encourage researchers to consider the relationships between enrichment and gender more closely. We tested the relationships presented as a combined sample but with gender as a moderator, and while we found the same direct effects from WFE Capital, we also found a direct effect from the FWE Affect dimension because the sample is combined (and our sample is slightly more women). Consequently, a combined sample would not determine the gender difference in regards to the effect of FWE Affect on life satisfaction being significant for women only. As such, where possible, researchers might want to consider a multi-group test of relationships to determine whether the effects found here are typical across enrichment or indeed, the wider work-family field. Future research might also seek to explore the influence of work-family conflict and work-family enrichment simultaneously on life satisfaction, as this might also provide further elucidations to understanding the importance of work and family roles on life satisfaction. Furthermore, different antecedents might be explored as well (e.g., job demands) to provide greater understanding of what builds and thwarts enrichment amongst employees. Across all these suggestions, we encourage a gender approach. This is further supported by the total variance explained, which clearly highlight the differences in model prediction strength, with the life satisfaction model for women at twice the variance than men. Multi-group tests would at least provide for greater accuracy in model predictive strength across respondent gender.

Limitations. Typical of employee studies our data is self-reported and cross-sectional. However, the use of CFA in SEM does alleviated this limitation somewhat as does the metric invariance test (Haar et al., 2014). One common test of common method variance (CMV) is Harman’s One Factor Test (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003), which has been used in the work-family literature as a rudimentary test (e.g., Haar & Roche, 2010). We conducted three unrotated factor analyses (combined data, women only, men only) and they all resulted in a number of factors, with the largest factor accounting for around 30% of the overall variance, suggesting CMV is not an issue (Haar &
Roche, 2010). We also note the large number of organizations approached, the broad range of professions and sectors as evidence of broad generalizability from our study.

Conclusion. The present study sought to understand the influence of job autonomy and work-family enrichment on life satisfaction, and in particular highlighting potential gender differences. While we found strong and consistent relationships between job autonomy and enrichment dimensions and life satisfaction, it was particularly with enrichment that gender differences became starkly identified. Overall, while WFE Capital is important for both genders, it is the positive mood from home (FWE Affect) that only women have as a significant predictor of life satisfaction. Including the strength of the model for women’s life satisfaction (twice that of men) suggests that towards life satisfaction, job autonomy and enrichment play a sizeable role in understanding.
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Table 1. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Study Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model Fit Indices</th>
<th>Model Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \chi^2 )</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hypothesized 8 factor model: Job Autonomy, WFE Development, WFE Affect, WFE Capital, FWE Development, FWE Affect, FWE Efficiency, and Life Satisfaction.</td>
<td>574.4</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alternative 5-factor model: Job Autonomy, WFE Development and FWE Development combined, WFE Affect and FWE Affect combined, WFE Capital and FWE Efficiency combined, and Life Satisfaction.</td>
<td>3028.2</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Alternative 3-factor model: Job Autonomy, WFE Development, WFE Affect and WFE Capital combined, FWE Development, FWE Affect and FWE Efficiency combined, and Life Satisfaction.</td>
<td>2654.8</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hours Worked</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job Autonomy</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. WFE Development</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WFE Affect</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. WFE Capital</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FWE Development</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. FWE Affect</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. FWE Efficiency</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=399, *p<.05, ‡p<.01
Table 3. Final Structural Model Path Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Unstandardized path coefficient</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Membership → Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Membership → WFE Development</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Membership → FWE Affect</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked → FWE Efficiency</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked → WFE Affect</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education → FWE Efficiency</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Effects:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy → WFE Development</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy → WFE Affect</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy → WFE Capital</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy → FWE Development</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy → FWE Affect</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy → FWE Efficiency</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy → Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFE Capital → Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWE Affect → Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r^2$ Values:
- WFE Development: .16, .10
- WFE Affect: .14, .24
- WFE Capital: .26, .19
- FWE Development: .09, .02
- FWE Affect: .07, .05
- FWE Efficiency: .13, .10
- Life Satisfaction: .18, .36

Only significant effects are shown. Unstandardized path coefficients.
†p<.1, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.
-- = non-significant effect
Figure 1. Theoretical Model
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