



Work-to-family enrichment: Influences of work resources, work engagement and satisfaction among employees within the South African context

Marissa De Klerk, Jan Alewyn Nel & Eileen Koekemoer

To cite this article: Marissa De Klerk, Jan Alewyn Nel & Eileen Koekemoer (2015) Work-to-family enrichment: Influences of work resources, work engagement and satisfaction among employees within the South African context, *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 25:6, 537-546

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14330237.2015.1124606>



Published online: 21 Dec 2015.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 116



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Work-to-family enrichment: Influences of work resources, work engagement and satisfaction among employees within the South African context

Marissa De Klerk*, Jan Alewyn Nel and Eileen Koekemoer

WorkWell Research Unit, North-West University, Potchefstroom Campus, Potchefstroom, South Africa

*Corresponding author email: marissa.deklerk@nwu.ac.za

The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship of work resources, work-to-family enrichment, engagement and job satisfaction among employees in the South African context. Data were collected from 627 participants (females = 67%, Afrikaans or English speakers = 81.8%). The analysis utilised multiple regression analysis to predict work resources and work-to-family enrichment dimensions from work engagement dimensions, job satisfaction and career satisfaction. In the multiple regression analyses, work-related development opportunities, work autonomy and work-family affect were significant predictors of work vigour. Furthermore, work-related development opportunities, work autonomy, work-family affect and work-family perspectives were significant predictors of work dedication, job satisfaction and career satisfaction. Results support the idea that participation in one role may enrich the quality of life in the other role and provides a more comprehensive understanding of the positive side of the work/family interface.

Keywords: work resources, work-to-family enrichment dimensions, work engagement, job satisfaction and career satisfaction, South African employee

Introduction

Researchers have sought a better understanding of the relationship of work-to-family enrichment (henceforth WFE) and a variety of important antecedents (e.g. autonomy, developmental experiences, job characteristics, support from co-workers and support from the supervisor) and outcomes. These outcomes include both the aspects of *career satisfaction* (Gordon, Whelan-Berry, & Hamilton, 2007; Jaga, & Bagraim, 2011; Lu, Siu, Spector, & Shi, 2009) and *work satisfaction* (Balmforth, & Gardner, 2006; Bhargava, & Baral, 2009; Boyar, & Mosley, 2007; Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006; Carlson, Grzywacz, & Zivnuska, 2009; Carlson, Grzywacz, & Kacmar, 2010; Carlson, Zivnuska, Kacmar, Ferguson, & Whitten, 2011; Gordon et al., 2007; Hanson, Hammer, & Colton, 2006; Hill, 2005; Jaga, & Bagraim, 2011; Karatepe, & Kilic, 2009; Lourel, Ford, Gamassou, Gueguen, & Hartmann, 2009; Lu et al., 2009; Masuda, McNall, Allen, & Nicklin, 2012; McNall, Masuda, & Nicklin, 2010; Van Steenberg, Ellemers, & Mooijaart, 2007; Voydanoff, 2005; Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004; Wayne, Randel, & Stevens, 2006). The general objective of this study was to determine the relationship between work resources, WFE, engagement and satisfaction among employees within the South African context.

Limited research has been undertaken in South Africa on the relationship between antecedents and outcomes related to WFE. One such study is that of Jaga and Bagraim (2011), whose findings reveal that career satisfaction and job satisfaction were significant outcomes of WFE. Although the relationship between WFE and outcomes has been researched within the South African context (e.g. Jaga, & Bagraim, 2011), more research is needed on the relationship of this enrichment between work and family, with the following antecedents: work resources (i.e. work support, work-related developmental opportunities, work autonomy), as well as outcomes such as work engagement

(i.e. work vigour and work dedication), job satisfaction and career satisfaction.

Work-family enrichment

Work-family enrichment refers to the idea that engaging in work and family roles can be mutually beneficial. In other words, work and family participation each provides individuals with resources (i.e. skills and perspectives – psychological and physical, social capital, flexibility, material resources) in the one domain that may help the individual to improve his/her quality of performance in the other domain, or may influence the person's psychological state of affect (Barnett, & Hyde, 2001; Friedman, & Greenhaus, 2000; Greenhaus, & Powell, 2006). These resources enable improved performance in the other role, either directly (i.e. instrumental path) or indirectly (i.e. affective path).

The relationship between WFE and work resources

Work antecedents such as work resources should be seen as the primary predictors of WFE (Aryee, Srinivas, & Tan, 2005; Greenhaus, & Powell, 2006; Grzywacz, & Marks, 2000). Work resources refer to those physical, psychological, social or organisational aspects of the job. These aspects are found to (1) be functional in achieving work goals; (2) reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs; and (3) stimulate personal growth and development (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). Resources may be located in the task itself (e.g. performance feedback, skill variety, task significance, task identity, autonomy; cf. Hackman, & Oldham, 1976). The resources can also be located within the context of the task, for instance organisational resources (e.g. career opportunities, job security, salary) and social resources (e.g. supervisor and co-worker support, team climate).

Work resources may play a dual motivational role: intrinsic, because these resources foster employees' growth, learning and development, or extrinsic, because they are instrumental in achieving work goals (Demerouti et al., 2001). Research indicating a relationship between WFE and work resources included the following antecedents: autonomy (Carlson et al., 2006; Grzywacz, & Butler, 2005; Karimi, & Nouri, 2009; Siu et al., 2010), developmental experiences (Carlson et al., 2006), work resources (Hakanen, Peeters, & Perhoniemi, 2011), support from co-workers (Wadsworth, & Owens, 2007), and support from the supervisor (Baral, & Bhargava, 2011; Bhargava, & Baral, 2009; Cinamon, & Rich, 2010; Siu et al., 2010; Taylor, Delcampo, & Blancero, 2009; Van Steenbergen et al., 2009; Wadsworth, & Owens, 2007). According to Baral and Bhargava (2011), work resources may increase the employees' perceived control over work and family matters. Such resources may also provide motivation and energy for employees and help them acquire new skills (e.g. time management skills; Friedman, & Greenhaus, 2000), which may help these employees to perform better in the family domain and consequently may result in enrichment between their work and family domain.

The relationship between WFE, engagement and satisfaction

Work engagement refers to a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual or behaviour (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002). It is characterised by vigour, dedication and absorption. WFE can predict future work engagement, which, in turn, can predict WFE (Hakanen et al., 2011). According to Siu et al. (2010), highly engaged employees show a strong identity with their work, attach meaning and significance to their assignments, welcome challenges in their job and entertain the belief that they will continuously learn and grow in their work (Bakker, & Leiter, 2010). They also experience vigour, energy and an upbeat mood at work, which they, in turn, transfer to their family domain. To date, relatively little research has been done on the relationship between work resources, WFE and work engagement. However, a few studies, for example, did indicate the mediation relationship. Siu et al. (2010) found that work engagement mediates the relationship between supervisor support and job autonomy and WFE. It has also been found that WFE can predict work engagement (Hakanen et al., 2011).

Job satisfaction refers to employees' feeling or affective responses to certain facets of their job and can be considered as overall satisfaction with their occupation (Tett, & Meyer, 1993). Findings from the literature revealed that WFE is associated with job satisfaction (Aryee et al., 2005; Balmforth, & Gardner, 2006; Boyar, & Mosley, 2007; Carlson et al., 2006; Jaga, & Bagraim, 2011; Van Steenbergen et al., 2007; Wayne et al., 2004; Wayne et al., 2006). According to Wayne et al. (2004), it may be suggested that employees' satisfaction with their job is closely linked to the degree of enrichment that their work brings to their families.

Correspondingly, career satisfaction refers to the success employees have achieved in their career and is associated with WFE. Several studies have indicated this association (Gordon et al., 2007; Jaga, & Bagraim, 2011). According to Gordon et al. (2007), employees who experience WFE and a sense of career satisfaction might be more satisfied with the success they have achieved in their careers.

Research questions

In light of the above discussion, the following research questions were formulated:

- Are work resources, dimensions of work-to-family enrichment (WFE), work engagement, job satisfaction and career satisfaction significantly related to each other?
- Do work resources and dimensions of WFE significantly predict work vigour?
- Do work resources and dimensions of WFE significantly predict work dedication?
- Do work resources and dimensions of WFE significantly predict job satisfaction?
- Do work resources and dimensions of WFE significantly predict career satisfaction?

Objectives of the study

The general objective of the current study is to determine the relationship between work resources, WFE, engagement and satisfaction among employees within the South African context. More specifically, the research objectives were:

- to determine whether work resources, dimensions of work-to-family enrichment (WFE), work engagement, job satisfaction and career satisfaction are significantly related to each other
- to determine whether work resources and dimensions of WFE significantly predict work vigour
- to determine whether work resources and dimensions of WFE significantly predict work dedication
- to determine whether work resources and dimensions of WFE significantly predict job satisfaction, and
- to determine whether work resources and dimensions of WFE significantly predict career satisfaction.

Method

Participants and setting

A convenience sample of $N = 627$ of employees from various industries in South Africa served as study participants (agricultural/practical industry = 35.9%, education = 25.2%, humanities = 21.7%). Table 1 shows some of the characteristics of the participants.

Table 1 indicates that the sample was mostly female (67.0%), white (81.8%), speaking Afrikaans or English as a home language (81.8%) and between the ages of 24 and 33 years (36.0%). The majority of the participants worked in an agricultural/practical industry (35.9%) and had a highest qualification of grade 12 (30%). Furthermore, 44.3% of employees were married and had children.

Table 1: Background information of the participants ($N = 627$)

Item	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	206	32.9
	Female	420	67.0
	Missing values	1	0.20
Year of birth	1940–1949	8	1.3
	1950–1959	74	11.8
	1960–1969	123	19.6
	1970–1979	149	23.8
	1980–1989	226	36.0
	1990–1995	41	6.5
	Missing	6	1.0
Language	Afrikaans or English	513	81.8
	African	79	12.6
	Missing	35	5.6
Industry	Humanities	136	21.7
	Education	158	25.2
	Administrative	96	15.3
	Agricultural/Practical	225	35.9
	Missing	12	1.9
Qualification	Lower than Grade 10	7	1.1
	Grade 10	12	1.9
	Grade 11	9	1.4
	Grade 12	188	30.0
	Post-matric diploma (Technicon or Diploma)	107	17.1
	University degree	112	17.9
	Postgraduate degree	168	26.8
	Other/Missing	24	3.8
Household	Living with parents, without children	57	9.1
	Living with parents, with children	24	3.8
	Single/divorced without children	98	15.6
	Single/divorced with children	41	6.5
	Married without children	104	16.6
	Married with children	278	44.3
	Other/missing	24	3.9

Measuring instruments

Participants completed a work resources measure (consisting of work support, work-related developmental opportunities and work autonomy), work-family enrichment instrument, work engagement measure as well as job and career satisfaction scales. These are described next.

Work resources

Work resources were measured by the work resources scale consisting of work support (3 items) (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbreke, 2004), work-related development opportunities (3 items) (Demerouti, Bakker, & Vuydanoff, 2010) and work autonomy (3 items) (Bakker et al., 2004). The measure was scored on a four-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (*never*) to 3 (*always*). Previous studies reported Cronbach alpha coefficients that ranged between 0.68 and 0.74 for *work autonomy*, and between 0.81 and 0.85 for *work support* (Bakker et al., 2004; Bakker et al., 2005).

Work-family enrichment

WFE was measured using the 18-item MACE Work-Family Enrichment Instrument (De Klerk, Nel, Hill, & Koekemoer, 2014). The WFE dimensions assessed were *work-family perspectives* (6 items), *work-family affect* (3 items), *work-family time management* (6 items) and *work-family socio-capital* (3 items). Respondents indicated their levels of agreement with each statement on a four-point scale; 1 (*disagree*), 2 (*neither agree nor disagree*),

3 (*agree*) and 4 (*strongly agree*). Reliable Cronbach alpha coefficients were found, according to which *work-family perspectives* is 0.91, *work-family affect* is 0.84, *work-family time management* is 0.90 and *work-family socio-capital* is 0.80 (De Klerk et al., 2014).

Work engagement

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) (Schaufeli et al., 2002) was used to assess the dimensions of *work vigour* (4 items) and *work dedication* (4 items). The measure was scored on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 7 (*every day*). In a study conducted by Storm (2002) on the South African Police Service, the following alpha coefficients were achieved on the dimensions: *work vigour* = 0.78 and *work dedication* = 0.89.

Job and career satisfaction

The *job satisfaction scale* (3 items) (Hellgren, Sjöberg, & Sverke, 1997) was used to measure the employees' job satisfaction. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (*disagree*) to 5 (*agree*), and a high score reflects satisfaction with the job. Cronbach alpha reliability as reported by Helgren et al. (1997) was high (0.88). The *career satisfaction scale* (4 items) was used to measure the employees' career satisfaction. The items were measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Cronbach alpha reliability for this scale as reported by Greenhaus, Parasuraman and Wormley (1990) was 0.88.

Procedure and preliminary analysis

Trained fieldworkers distributed questionnaire booklets to the employees, who were working in various industries. A letter requesting participation was included in the questionnaire booklet, as well as an explanation of ethical aspects and a motivation about the importance of the research. Furthermore, in the letter, assurances were given to participants on the anonymity and confidentiality with which the information would be handled. Participants gave their consent by signing the informed consent letter, which was included as part of the questionnaire booklet. These participants were given various options for returning the questionnaire booklets to the researchers (e.g. personal collection, electronic mail). All participants were given two to three weeks to complete the questionnaire booklets.

Cronbach alpha coefficients were used to determine the reliability of the data. To analyse the data further, descriptive statistics were used (i.e. means and standard deviations). The results for the reliability are reported in Table 2.

It is evident from Table 2 that acceptable Cronbach alpha coefficients were obtained for all scales, since they were higher than the guideline of $\alpha > 0.70$ (Nunnally, & Bernstein, 1994), ranging from 0.70 to 0.93. It therefore appears that all the measuring instruments have acceptable levels of internal consistency.

The AMOS program (Arbuckle, 2011) was used to carry out the construct validation of the measures. The construct validity of scores from the measuring instruments was tested by using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The χ^2 and several other goodness-of-fit indices were used to summarise the degree of correspondence between the implied and observed covariance matrices. The following goodness-of-fit indices were used as adjuncts to the likelihood-ratio chi-square (χ^2) statistics: (1) the root square of approximation (RMSEA); (2) the comparative fit index (CFI); (3) Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) and (4) the incremental fit index (IFI). The CFI, TLI and IFI were used in the likelihood of ratio chi-square (χ^2) being sensitive to sample size – which means that the probability of rejecting a hypothesised model increases with sample size (Bentler, 1990). Acceptable fit of the model was indicated by non-significant χ^2 values, values smaller than or equal to 0.90 for CFI, TLI and IFI, also RMSEA

values smaller than or equal to 0.08 (Browne, & Cudeck, 1993). The results supported a three-factor model for work resources (work support, work-related developmental opportunities and work autonomy: $\chi^2 = 122.73$ ($N = 627$), IFI = 0.95, TLI = 0.93 and CFI = 0.95; RMSEA = 0.08); a four-factor model for WFE (work-family perspectives, work-family affect, work-family time management, work-family socio-capital: $\chi^2 = 364.31$ ($N = 627$), IFI = 0.97, TLI = 0.96 and CFI = 0.97; RMSEA = 0.05); a two-factor model for work engagement: (work vigour and work dedication: $\chi^2 = 88.44$ ($N = 627$), IFI = 0.98, TLI = 0.97 and CFI = 0.98; RMSEA = 0.08); and a one-factor model for career satisfaction: ($\chi^2 = 2.66$ ($N = 627$), IFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.00 and CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = 0.02).

Data analysis

The SPSS program (IBM SPSS Statistics 20, 2013) was used to carry out the statistical analysis. Product-moment correlation coefficients were used to specify the relationship between the variables. In terms of statistical significance, it was decided to set the value at a 95% confidence interval level ($p < 0.05$). Because statistical significance may show results that are practically of little relevance, effect sizes were used to determine the practical significance of the relationship (Cohen, 1988; Steyn, 2002). The cut-off point for practical significance of the correlation coefficients was set at 0.30 (medium effect) and 0.50 (large effect) (Cohen, 1988).

Multiple-regression analyses were carried out to predict work vigour, work dedication, job satisfaction and career satisfaction by work resources and WFE dimensions.

Results

The descriptive statistical evidence (Table 2) suggests that work-family perspectives correlated (with a medium effect) with work-related developmental opportunities, work autonomy, work vigour, work dedication, job satisfaction and career satisfaction. Work-family affect related (with a medium effect) to all three work resources, work vigour, work dedication, job satisfaction and career satisfaction. Furthermore, work-family time management related (with a medium effect) to work-related developmental opportunities, work autonomy, work dedication, job satisfaction and career satisfaction.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics, Cronbach alpha coefficients and product-moment correlations for work resources, work-to-family enrichment dimensions, work engagement, job satisfaction and career satisfaction

Item	M	SD	α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Work support	2.99	0.65	0.74	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2. Work-related developmental opportunities	2.94	0.75	0.84	0.45+*	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3. Work autonomy	2.93	0.66	0.70	0.44+*	0.53+**	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
4. Work-family perspectives	2.74	0.65	0.91	0.24+	0.42+*	0.33+*	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5. Work-family affect	2.65	0.78	0.84	0.30+*	0.42+*	0.36+*	0.54+**	–	–	–	–	–	–
6. Work-family time management	2.72	0.67	0.90	0.22+	0.34+*	0.32+**	0.60+**	0.56+**	–	–	–	–	–
7. Work-family socio-capital	2.74	0.68	0.80	0.43+*	0.29+	0.28+	0.55+**	0.56+**	0.63+**	–	–	–	–
8. Work vigour	5.40	1.18	0.85	0.32+*	0.44+*	0.46+*	0.30+*	0.39+*	0.29+	0.26+	–	–	–
9. Work dedication	5.44	1.50	0.93	0.38+*	0.50+**	0.43+*	0.40+*	0.48+*	0.30+*	0.27+	0.79+**	–	–
10. Job satisfaction	3.95	1.01	0.88	0.33+*	0.48+*	0.43+*	0.41+*	0.43+*	0.33+*	0.29+	0.60+**	0.70+**	–
11. Career satisfaction	3.80	1.03	0.91	0.26+	0.52+**	0.43+*	0.41+	0.42+*	0.34+*	0.26+	0.60+**	0.71+**	0.89+**

+ Statistically significant ($p < 0.01$)

*Correlation is practically significant $r > 0.30$ (medium effect); ** Correlation is practically significant $r > 0.50$ (large effect)

Work-family socio-capital related (with a medium effect) to work support.

Work resources, WFE and work engagement

Multiple regression analyses were done (Table 3) with work resources and WFE dimensions as predictors of work vigour.

As can be seen in Table 3, entries of all the variables in the final step of the regression analysis produced a statistically significant model ($F(7, 619) = 38.29; p = 0.00; \Delta R^2 = 0.29$), accounting for 30% of the total variance. More specifically it seems that work-related development opportunities ($\beta = 0.18; t = 4.18; p \leq 0.05$), work autonomy ($\beta = 0.26; t = 6.20; p \leq 0.05$) and work-family affect ($\beta = 0.19; t = 4.25; p \leq 0.05$) is a significant predictor of work vigour.

Multiple regressions were done were (Table 4) with work resources and WFE dimensions as predictors of work dedication.

Entry of the all the variables in the final step of the regression analysis as seen in Table 4 produced a statistically significant model ($F(7, 619) = 50.73; p = 0.00;$

$\Delta R^2 = 0.36$) accounting for 37% of the total variance. It was shown that work-related development opportunities ($\beta = 0.30; t = 7.18; p \leq 0.05$), work autonomy ($\beta = 0.15; t = 3.62; p \leq 0.05$), work-family perspectives ($\beta = 0.13; t = 2.92; p \leq 0.05$) and work-family affect ($\beta = 0.26; t = 5.95; p \leq 0.05$) are significant predictors of work dedication.

Work resources, WFE and job satisfaction

Multiple regression analysis was done (Table 5) where work resources and WFE dimensions were predictors of job satisfaction.

As seen in Table 5, entries of all the variables in the final step of the regression analysis produced a statistically significant model ($F(7, 619) = 52.41; p = 0.00; \Delta R^2 = 0.37$) accounting for 37% of the total variance. It appears that work-related development opportunities ($\beta = 0.26; t = 6.16; p \leq 0.05$), work autonomy ($\beta = 0.19; t = 4.75; p \leq 0.05$), work-family perspectives ($\beta = 0.16; t = 3.55; p \leq 0.05$), work-family affect ($\beta = 0.21; t = 4.76; p \leq 0.05$) and work-family socio-capital ($\beta = -0.10; t = -2.01; p \leq 0.05$) are significant predictors of job satisfaction.

Table 3: Multiple regression analysis with work vigour as dependent variable

Model	Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	t	p	F	R	R2	ΔR2
	B	SE	β						
1 (Constant)	2.30	0.22		10.37	0.00*	76.65	0.52	0.27	0.27
Work support	0.13	0.07	0.07	1.80	0.07				
Work-related developmental opportunities	0.39	0.07	0.25	5.99	0.00*				
Work autonomy	0.53	0.07	0.30	7.12	0.00*				
2 (Constant)	1.99	0.24		8.19	0.00*	38.29	0.55	0.30	0.29
Work support	0.12	0.08	0.07	1.54	0.13				
Work-related developmental opportunities	0.29	0.07	0.18	4.18	0.00*				
Work autonomy	0.46	0.07	0.26	6.20	0.00*				
Work-family perspectives	0.04	0.08	0.02	0.50	0.61				
Work-family affect	0.29	0.07	0.19	4.25	0.00*				
Work-family time management	0.05	0.09	0.03	0.62	0.54				
Work-family socio-capital	-0.06	0.09	-0.04	-0.73	0.47				

* $p < 0.05$

Table 4: Multiple regression analysis with work dedication as dependent variable

Model	Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	t	p	F	R	R ²	ΔR ²
	B	SE	β						
1 (Constant)	1.58	0.28		5.74	0.00*	89.28	0.55	0.30	0.30
Work support	0.06	0.09	0.03	0.63	0.53				
Work-related developmental opportunities	0.81	0.08	0.41	9.91	0.00*				
Work autonomy	0.44	0.09	0.20	4.78	0.00*				
2 (Constant)	1.03	0.30		3.48	0.00*	50.73	0.60	0.37	0.36
Work support	0.07	0.09	0.03	0.74	0.46				
Work-related developmental opportunities	0.60	0.08	0.30	7.18	0.00*				
Work autonomy	0.33	0.09	0.15	3.62	0.00*				
Work-family perspectives	0.30	0.10	0.13	2.92	0.00*				
Work-family affect	0.49	0.08	0.26	5.95	0.00*				
Work-family time management	-0.04	0.10	-0.02	-0.33	0.74				
Work-family socio-capital	-0.20	0.11	-0.09	-1.90	0.06				

* $p < 0.05$

Work resources, WFE and career satisfaction

Table 6 summarises the multiple regression analysis done with work resources and WFE dimensions as predictors of career satisfaction.

Entry of all the work resources and WFE dimensions in the final step of the regression analyses as seen in Table 6 produced a statistically significant model ($F(7, 619) = 50.23$; $p = 0.00$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.36$), accounting for 36% of the total variance. It appears that work-related development opportunities ($\beta = 0.31$; $t = 7.41$; $p \leq 0.05$), work autonomy ($\beta = 0.17$; $t = 4.24$; $p \leq 0.05$), work-family perspectives ($\beta = 0.16$; $t = 3.60$; $p \leq 0.05$) and work-family affect ($\beta = 0.17$; $t = 3.99$; $p \leq 0.05$) are significant predictors of career satisfaction.

Discussion

The results indicated that the four WFE dimensions are related to various work resources and work engagement dimensions, as well as to job satisfaction and career satisfaction. More specifically, work-related developmental opportunities and work autonomy were related to work-family perspectives, work-family affect and work-family time management. Marais, de Klerk, Nel and de Beer (2014) also found positive relationships between work resources and the dimensions of WFE.

This may suggest that if employees' work allows them the opportunity to develop themselves (e.g. through training and development), it may lead to the acquisition of new skills, concepts, or attitudes, emotional benefits and skills in time management (de Klerk et al., 2014). These, in turn, are energy resources that promote gains in the work domain and also benefit the employees' functioning within the family environment. Voydanoff (2004) found that self-reported learning opportunities on the job were associated with more WFE. Furthermore, if employees experience that they have control over their own projects at work and make the decisions on their own projects, they may learn new skills, also how to manage their time efficiently and feel content about being in control of their own assignments (Baral, & Bhargava, 2010; Grzywacz, & Marks, 2000; Grzywacz, & Butler, 2005; Voydanoff, 2004). Their family may benefit from this condition, as it may help employees attend to family matters when necessary.

Work support was related to work-family affect and work-family socio-capital. Carlson et al. (2006) also found work support to be related to certain dimensions of WFE (e.g. work-family development, work-family affect and work-family capital). This may suggest that having supportive co-workers or supervisors may help employees

Table 5: Multiple regression analysis with job satisfaction as dependent variable

Model		Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2
		<i>B</i>	SE	β						
1	(Constant)	1.20	0.18		6.51	0.00*	94.59	0.56	0.31	0.31
	Work support	0.08	0.06	0.05	1.34	0.18				
	Work-related developmental opportunities	0.49	0.06	0.36	8.95	0.00*				
	Work autonomy	0.37	0.06	0.24	5.95	0.00*				
2	(Constant)	0.75	0.20		3.80	0.00*	52.41	0.61	0.37	0.37
	Work support	0.09	0.06	0.06	1.52	0.13				
	Work-related developmental opportunities	0.34	0.06	0.26	6.16	0.00*				
	Work autonomy	0.29	0.06	0.19	4.75	0.00*				
	Work-family perspectives	0.24	0.07	0.16	3.55	0.00*				
	Work-family affect	0.26	0.06	0.21	4.76	0.00*				
	Work-family time management	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.47	0.64				
Work-family socio-capital	-0.14	0.07	-0.10	-2.01	0.05*					

* $p < 0.05$

Table 6: Multiple regression analysis with career satisfaction as dependent variable

Model		Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2
		<i>B</i>	SE	β						
1	(Constant)	1.22	0.19		6.40	0.00*	91.51	0.55	0.31	0.30
	Work support	-0.04	0.06	-0.03	-0.67	0.51				
	Work-related developmental opportunities	0.57	0.06	0.42	10.18	0.00*				
	Work autonomy	0.35	0.06	0.22	5.47	0.00*				
2	(Constant)	0.71	0.20		3.49	0.00*	50.23	0.60	0.36	0.36
	Work support	-0.03	0.06	-0.02	-0.44	0.66				
	Work-related developmental opportunities	0.43	0.06	0.31	7.41	0.00*				
	Work autonomy	0.27	0.06	0.17	4.24	0.00*				
	Work-family perspectives	0.25	0.07	0.16	3.60	0.00*				
	Work-family affect	0.23	0.06	0.17	3.99	0.00*				
	Work-family time management	0.07	0.07	0.05	1.00	0.32				
	Work-family socio-capital	-0.13	0.07	-0.09	-1.82	0.07				

* $p < 0.05$

to deal with issues related to the family environment (Carlson et al., 2006). As a result, these employees show support to their family members, and know that there is also support at work. Bhargava and Baral (2009) also suggested that support at work may expand an individual's psychological resource base such as confidence, which enhances satisfaction and performance not only in the work domain but also in the family domain. This condition may generate feelings of contentment in the person, which also carries over and enhances his/her functioning in the family role. According to Frone, Yardley and Markel (1997), support gained at work from co-workers and supervisors is a resource that can improve performance and increase well-being in the employees' family role. These studies on WFE dimensions with antecedents are in line with previous studies (Baral, & Bhargava, 2011; Bhargava, & Baral, 2009; Carlson et al., 2006; Cinamon, & Rich, 2010; Grzywacz & Butler, 2005; Hakanen et al., 2011; Karimi, & Nouri, 2009; Siu et al., 2010; Taylor et al., 2009; van Steenbergen et al., 2009; Wadsworth, & Owens, 2007).

Work dedication was related to work-family perspectives, work-family affect and work-family time management. This is also supported by previous research that found a positive relation between WFE dimensions and work dedication (Hakanen et al., 2011). It may be suggested that resources acquired at work (e.g. skills, self-esteem, time management) may result in improved performance at work (i.e. managing one's time to finish work before deadlines). This state of affairs can create more positive affect at work, which ultimately transfers to more positive affect in the family domain and more time spent within the family domain (Hakanen et al., 2011). This, in turn, may lead to higher dedication towards the employees' work. Siu et al. (2010) also suggests that having dedication at work is also likely to have a positive impact on the atmosphere at home and may therefore result in work-to-family enrichment.

Work vigour was related to work-family perspectives and work-family affect. This finding is also supported by Marais et al. (2014). This may suggest that if employees acquire more resources from work (i.e. learning new skills or values from other colleagues), it may improve their functioning at work, which might generate positive feelings in the work. This condition ultimately may transfer to more positive feelings in the family domain. Hakanen et al. (2011) also suggests that when employees experience enrichment at home, it may improve their vigour at work, because they have a desire to be more engaged because of their positive feelings and the acquisition of new skills.

Job satisfaction and career satisfaction were related to work-family perspectives, work-family affect and work-family time management. This finding is supported by Jaga and Bagraim (2011). This may suggest that resources acquired at work (e.g. self-esteem, time management) may result in improved performance at work, which has the effect of creating more positive affect at work, ultimately transferring to more positive affect in the family domain and, in turn, leading to higher job satisfaction (Gordon et al., 2007; Jaga, & Bagraim, 2011).

Work-related developmental opportunities, work autonomy, work-family affect and work-family

perspectives significantly predicted high levels of both job satisfaction and career satisfaction. These findings are consistent with previous research (Aryee et al., 2005; Balmforth, & Gardner, 2006; Boyar, & Mosley, 2007; Carlson et al., 2006; Jaga, & Bagraim, 2011; Van Steenbergen et al., 2007; Wayne et al., 2004). This may be because employees who have resources such as autonomy and developmental opportunities in their work gain new skills, perspectives and values. This gives them greater satisfaction in their work and career situation and consequently employees may feel more content with the progress towards the goals they have set in their work life (Jaga, & Bagraim, 2011). The positive emotions that employees experience as a result, as well as the positive attitudes they gain from their work situation, may help to improve their self-esteem and confidence in their family life, and resultantly increase their performance within the family domain. In turn, this experience increases the positive energy that employees transfer to the work domain. This finding supports past research by Gordon et al. (2007).

Work-family social capital significantly predicted lower levels of job satisfaction. An explanation can be that employees may gain support from their work by their supervisor or colleagues if a crisis occurs in the family (Frone et al., 1997). However, this support may only be limited to family matters (e.g. a family crisis) and therefore the support gained does not help the employee to achieve goals in the workplace. As a result, the satisfaction to achieve the goal to be successful in their work environment is lower.

Work-related developmental opportunities and work autonomy were the two work resources that significantly predicted both the work engagement dimensions (e.g. work dedication and work vigour). Regarding the relationship between the four WFE dimensions, the results showed that work-family affect significantly predicted work dedication as well as work vigour. Furthermore, it was shown that work-family perspectives significantly predicted work dedication. This is supported by previous findings which suggested that positive involvement in both work life and family life can lead to engagement at work (e.g. Montgomery, Peeters, Schaufeli, & Den Ouden, 2003; Mostert, Cronje, & Pienaar, 2006; Van Aarde, & Mostert, 2008).

Based on these results mentioned above, it appears that employees who have work resources such as developmental opportunities (i.e. the opportunity to develop strong points and to learn new things) and autonomy in their work (i.e. freedom in carrying out own work activities, freedom in deciding the time spent on a task) are more contented, which will lead to engagement (Halbesleben, & Wheeler, 2008; Hobfoll, 2001). Employees may feel happy about this condition, which, in turn, improves their family life as they may use the new skills, perspectives or values obtained at work to enhance their family domain. In turn, this experience increases the positive energy in employees' work domain (Marais et al., 2014). This condition makes employees more dedicated to their work because of the opportunities at work (e.g. to learn new skills or perspectives), which make them

feel happy and create positive emotions that lead to work vigour. Therefore, a positive involvement of employees in their work and family lives may result in employees being more engaged at work (Hakanen et al., 2011; Montgomery et al., 2003; Mostert et al., 2006; Van Aarde, & Mostert, 2008).

Implications for human resource practice

Key findings of the study were that work-related developmental opportunities, work autonomy, work-family affect and work-family perspectives predicted high levels of both job satisfaction and career satisfaction. Furthermore, work-related developmental opportunities, work autonomy and work-family affect predicted work dedication and work vigour. Additionally work-family perspectives predicted work dedication. Current evidence supports the probability that if employees experience WFE, they are more likely experience more job satisfaction and engagement in their work (Franks, Schurink, & Fourie, 2006; Mostert et al., 2006; Montgomery et al., 2003; van Aarde, & Mostert, 2008). This study contributes by identifying possible predictors that can impact on employees' job and career satisfaction as well as their engagement. The results further provide more insight and understanding for organisations on the potential benefits of being involved in both the domains of work life and family life. The results could assist employees and organisations to become aware of the predictors (work resources and WFE dimensions) of job and career satisfaction as well as engagement. Certain work resources (such as work-related development opportunities and work autonomy) as well as the WFE dimensions could lead employees towards more job and career satisfaction as well as engagement. Organisations should therefore consider providing these work resources and WFE as employees may possibly transfer these resources to their family domain. This may possibly enhance the quality of their family life, which in turn may lead to potential consequences such as improved job and career satisfaction as well as work engagement. Furthermore, organisations should do additional research to identify work resources and outcomes related to WFE, which will enable them to develop programmes, policies and intervention plans that could be used to benefit employees within organisations. Organisations should also create a culture to encourage experiences of work-family enrichment among their employees as it results in benefits such as increased job satisfaction, career satisfaction and increased engagement.

Limitations and recommendations

Although this research provided some valuable findings, it is also necessary to note the limitations of the current study. The first limitation was the use of a cross-sectional design, which meant that causal relationships could not be determined among variables. Researchers should examine the work-family process over time by employing longitudinal designs (Montgomery et al., 2003). The second limitation was that self-reported questionnaires were used to reach the research objectives and this raises the concern of methodological bias (Oosthuizen, 2005). The third limitation was that the study sample was

dominated by females and employees speaking Afrikaans and English, which made it difficult to generalise the findings to males and other language groups. The fourth limitation is that the study only included a few work resources and outcomes that are associated with work-family enrichment. In future research, a broader range of antecedents and outcomes should be used, as it will improve the understanding of the relationship between various other antecedents and outcomes. It is also important to recognise the possibility that specific work resources and outcomes may differ across organisations.

Future studies should include other antecedents and outcome variables for a clearer picture of the complex relationship between work and family. Future research should also include more organisations to generalise the findings sufficiently. Organisations should consider work-related activities, policies and practices that facilitate work-family enrichment so that they can benefit from the positive outcomes which their employees experience (Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair, & Shafiro, 2005). It is also recommended that longitudinal research designs are used in work-family enrichment research, because levels of this type of enrichment undoubtedly fluctuate over time for different people. It is also recommended that the family-to-work enrichment direction should be investigated, as work-family enrichment is seen as bi-directional in nature.

Conclusion

The current study provides insights into the relationship of work resources (e.g. work support, work-related development opportunities and work autonomy), work-to-family enrichment dimensions and outcomes (e.g. work engagement, job satisfaction and career satisfaction). Findings of the research showed that dimensions of WFE were practically and statistically significantly associated with work resources and outcome variables such as job satisfaction, career satisfaction and work engagement. It was also evident that work-related development opportunities, work autonomy and work-family affect were significant predictors of work vigour. Furthermore, work-related development opportunities, work autonomy, work-family affect and work-family perspectives were significant predictors of work dedication, job satisfaction and career satisfaction. Therefore, the results support the idea that participation in one role may enrich the quality of life in the other role and provides a more comprehensive understanding of the positive side of the work/family interface.

References

- Arbuckle, J. L. (2011). *Amos Development Company*. Amos 20.0 Copyright 1983-2008. NET Framework Version 1.1.
- Aryee, S., Srinivas, E. S., & Tan, H. H. (2005, January). Rhythms of life: Antecedents and outcomes of work-family balance in employed parents. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(1), 132-146. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.132> PMID:15641894
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Euwema, M. C. (2005, April). Job resources buffer the impact of job demands on burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*(2), 170-180. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.2.170> PMID:15826226

- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management, 43*(1), 83–104. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20004>
- Bakker, A. B., & Leiter, M. P. (Eds.). (2010). *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Balmforth, K., & Gardner, D. (2006). Conflict and facilitation between work and family: Realizing the outcomes for organizations. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 35*(2), 69–76.
- Baral, R., & Bhargava, S. (2010). Work-family enrichment as a mediator between organizational interventions for work-life balance and job outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25*(3), 274–300. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683941011023749>
- Baral, R., & Bhargava, S. (2011). Examining the moderating influence of gender on the relationships between work-family antecedents and work-family enrichment. *Gender in Management: An International Journal, 26*(2), 122–147. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17542411111116545>
- Barnett, R. C., & Hyde, J. S. (2001, October). Women, men, work, and family. An expansionist theory. *The American Psychologist, 56*(10), 781–796. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.10.781> PMID:11675985
- Bhargava, S., & Baral, R. (2009). Antecedents and consequences of work-family enrichment among Indian managers. *Psychological Studies, 54*(3), 213–225. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12646-009-0028-z>
- Bentler, P. M. (1990, March). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*(2), 238–246. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238> PMID:2320703
- Boyar, S. L., & Mosley, D. C., Jr. (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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.06.001>
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136–162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Carlson, D. S., Grzywacz, J. G., & Kacmar, K. M. (2010). The relationship of schedule flexibility and outcomes via the work-family interface. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25*(4), 330–355. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683941011035278>
- Carlson, D. S., Grzywacz, J. G., & Zivnuska, S. (2009). Is work-family balance more than conflict and enrichment? *Human Relations, 62*, 1459–1486.
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.02.002>
- Carlson, D., Kacmar, K. M., Zivnuska, S., Ferguson, M., & Whitten, D. (2011, July). Work-family enrichment and job performance: A constructive replication of affective events theory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*(3), 297–312. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022880> PMID:21728437
- Cinamon, R. G., & Rich, Y. (2010). Work family relations: Antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Career Assessment, 18*(1), 59–70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1069072709340661>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Orlando, CA: Academic Press.
- De Klerk, M., Nel, J.A., Hill, C., & Koekemoer, E. (2014). *Work-family enrichment: Development, validation and application of a new instrument within the South African context*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, North-West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001, June). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 499–512. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499> PMID:11419809
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Voydanoff, P. (2010). Does home life interfere with or facilitate job performance? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 19*(2), 128–149. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13594320902930939>
- Franks, K., Schurink, W., & Fourie, L. (2006). Exploring the social construction of life roles of career-oriented women. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology, 32*(1), 17–24.
- Friedman, S. D., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2000). *Work and family – allies or enemies? What happens when business professionals confront life choices?* New York: Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195112757.001.0001>
- Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K., & Markel, K. S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work-to-family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*(2), 145–167. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.1577>
- Gordon, J. R., Whelan-Berry, K. S., & Hamilton, E. A. (2007, October). The relationship among work-family conflict and enhancement, organizational work-family culture, and work outcomes for older working women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(4), 350–364. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.4.350> PMID:17953494
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(1), 64–86. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256352>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and families are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review, 31*(1), 72–92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2006.19379625>
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Butler, A. B. (2005, April). The impact of job characteristics on work-to-family facilitation: Testing a theory and distinguishing a construct. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*(2), 97–109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.2.97> PMID:15826221
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000, January). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*(1), 111–126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.1.111> PMID:10658890
- Hakanen, J. J., Peeters, M. C. W., & Perhoniemi, R. (2011). Enrichment processes and gain spirals at work and at home: A 3-year cross-lagged panel study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84*(1), 8–30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2010.02014.x>
- Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Wheeler, A. R. (2008). The relative roles of engagement and embeddedness in predicting job performance and intention to leave. *Work and Stress, 22*(3), 242–256. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02678370802383962>
- Hammer, L. B., Cullen, J. C., Neal, M. B., Sinclair, R. R., & Shafiro, M. V. (2005, April). The longitudinal effects of work-family conflict and positive spillover on depressive symptoms among dual-earner couples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*(2), 138–154. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.2.138> PMID:15826224
- Hanson, G. C., Hammer, L. B., & Colton, C. L. (2006, July). Development and validation of a multidimensional scale of perceived work-family positive spillover. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*(3), 249–265. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.11.3.249> PMID:16834473
- Hellgren, J., Sjöberg, A., & Sverke, M. (1997). Intention to quit: Effects of job satisfaction and job perceptions. In F. Avallone, J. Arnold, & K. de Witte (Eds.), *Feelings work in Europe* (pp. 415–423). Milano: Guerini.

- Hill, E. J. (2005). Work-family facilitation and conflict, working fathers and mothers, work-family stressors and support. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(6), 793–819. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X05277542>
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology*, 50(3), 337–421. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00062>
- Jaga, A., & Bagraim, J. (2011). The relationship between work-family enrichment and work-family satisfaction outcomes. *South African Journal of Psychology: Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Sielkunde*, 41(1), 52–62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/008124631104100106>
- Karatepe, O. M., & Kilic, H. (2009). The effects of two directions of conflict and facilitation on frontline employees' job outcomes. *Service Industries Journal*, 29(7), 977–993. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02642060902749716>
- Karimi, L., & Nouri, A. (2009). Do work demands and resources predict work-to-family conflict and facilitation? A study of Iranian male employees. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 30(2), 193–202. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10834-009-9143-1>
- Lourel, M., Ford, M. T., Gamassou, C. E., Gueguen, N., & Hartmann, A. (2009). Negative and positive spillover between work and home. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(5), 438–449. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940910959762>
- Lu, J. F., Siu, O. L., Spector, P. E., & Shi, K. (2009, April). Antecedents and outcomes of a fourfold taxonomy of work-family balance in Chinese employed parents. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(2), 182–192. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014115> PMID:19331479thes
- Marais, E., De Klerk, M., Nel, J. A., & De Beer, L. T. (2014). The antecedents and outcomes of work-family enrichment amongst female workers. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40(1), 1–14.
- Masuda, A. D., McNall, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Nicklin, J. M. (2012). Examining the constructs of work-to-family enrichment and positive spillover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(1), 197–210. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.06.002>
- McNall, L. A., Masuda, A. D., & Nicklin, J. M. (2010, January-February). Flexible work arrangements, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions: The mediating role of work-to-family enrichment. *The Journal of Psychology*, 144(1), 61–81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00223980903356073> PMID:20092070
- McNall, L. A., Nicklin, J. M., & Masuda, A. A. (2010). A Meta-analytical review of the consequences associated with work-family enrichment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(3), 381–396. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9141-1>
- Montgomery, A. J., Peeters, M. C. W., Schaufeli, W. B., & Den Ouden, M. (2003). Work-home interference among newspaper managers: Its relationship with burnout and engagement. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, 16, 195–211.
- Mostert, K., Cronje, S., & Pienaar, J. (2006). Job resources, work engagement and the mediating role of positive work-home interaction of police officers in the North West Province. *Acta Criminologica*, 19(3), 64–87.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oosthuizen, B. (2005). *Job characteristics, coping and work-home interaction in a nursing environment*. Unpublished master's dissertation, North-West University, Potchefstroom.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A confirmative analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71–92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
- Siu, O., Lu, J., Brough, P., Lu, C., Bakker, A. B., Kalliath, T., . . . Shi, K. (2010). Role resources and work-family enrichment: The role of work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(3), 470–480. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.06.007>
- Steyn, H. S. (2002). Practically significant relationships between two variables. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28(3), 10–15.
- Storm, K. (2002). *Burnout and work engagement in the South African Police Service*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Potchefstroom University for CHE, Potchefstroom, South Africa.
- Taylor, B. L., Delcampo, R. G., & Blancero, D. M. (2009). Work-family conflict/facilitation and the role of workplace supports for U.S. Hispanic professionals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(5), 643–664. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.605>
- Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention and turnover. Path analyser based on meta-analytical findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(2), 259–293. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00874.x>
- Van Aarde, A., & Mostert, K. (2008). Work-home interaction of working females: What is the role of job and home characteristics? *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 34(3), 1–10.
- Van Steenbergen, E. F., Ellemers, N., & Mooijaart, A. (2009). Combining work and family: How family supportive work environments and work supportive home environments can reduce work-family conflict and enhance facilitation. In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (Eds.), *Handbook of families & work: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 279–300). New York: University Press of America.
- Voydanoff, P. (2004). The effects of work demands and resources on work-to-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 66(2), 398–412. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2004.00028.x>
- Voydanoff, P. (2005). The effects of community demands, resources, and strategies on the nature and consequences of the work-family interface: An agenda for future research. *Family Relations*, 54(5), 583–595. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2005.00343.x>
- Wadsworth, L. L., & Owens, B. P. (2007). The effects of social support on work-family enhancement and work-family conflict in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, 67(1), 75–87. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00698.x>
- Wayne, J. H., Musisca, N., & Fleeson, W. (2004). Considering the role of personality in the work-family experience: Relationships of the big five to work-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(1), 108–130. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(03\)00035-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00035-6)
- Wayne, J. H., Randel, A. E., & Stevens, J. (2006). The role of identity and work-family support in work-family enrichment and its work-related consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69(3), 445–461. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.07.002>