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**Abstract**

This study developed a moderated mediation model to investigate how family-supportive paid leave and supervision affect employees’ satisfaction with work-family balance and in turn their affective organizational commitment and supervisor-directed organizational citizenship behavior depending on their perceived insider status in the organization. Our analysis of data collected from 118 employee-supervisor dyads in Korean organizations revealed that satisfaction with work-family balance mediated the linkages from family-supportive supervision to affective organizational commitment and supervisor-directed organizational citizenship behavior and the linkage from family-supportive paid leave to affective organizational commitment. Results further showed that the entire mediational process for family-supportive supervision was more pronounced for those who perceived themselves to be insiders of their organizations, while the same pattern was not found for the meditational process related to family-supportive paid leave. Our findings provide theoretical implications for work-family balance research and offer practical suggestions to increase employee satisfaction with work-family balance.
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Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction with work-family balance:

A moderating role of perceived insider status

Satisfaction with work-family balance (SWFB) is defined as “an overall level of contentment resulting from an assessment of one’s degree of success at meeting work and family role demands” (Valcour, 2007, p. 1512). Work-family balance has been widely talked about in daily life but studied only lately compared to other existing segmented perceptions (e.g., conflict, enrichment, and facilitation) of the work-family interface (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). In that work-family balance is a global state where employees perceive compatibility between their work and family lives, SWFB describes an individual’s positive affective outcomes resulting from successful functioning in both settings (Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw, 2003; Valcour, 2007).

The current literature on SWFB contains meaningful theory and empirical evidence but is still limited in its understanding of the concept. For instance, previous studies examined its antecedents mostly narrowly defined in terms of job characteristics such as work hours (McNamara, Pitt-Catsouphes, Matz-Costa, Brown, & Valcour, 2013), job complexity, and control over work time (Valcour, 2007). Moreover, only a few studies have identified its consequences only in terms of an employee’s attitudes, including work life satisfaction (Grawitch, Maloney, Barber, & Mooshegian, 2013). However, given that most employees spend a considerable amount of their time in the workplace, more research needs to investigate SWFB’s antecedents related to workplace features (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011) and behavioral outcomes. More importantly, employees’ reactions to family-supportive benefit programs and supervision that help them to allocate more time, energy, and commitment to family responsibilities can differ (Kofodimos, 1993; Rothausen, 2016), depending on the value they assign to such supports and the level of comfort they feel in using those supports. Nonetheless, previous studies have ignored this possibility, so that it is imperative to investigate the between-person variation in achieving SWFB by using family supports available in the workplace (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). Lastly, it is problematic that previous research has reported evidence predominantly with U.S. samples (Powell, Francesco, & Ling, 2009), despite the growing interest in work-family balance around the globe (Lyness & Judiesch, 2014).

This study seeks to fill the above gaps by examining SWFB in South Korea (hereafter Korea). First, based on role balance theory (Marks & MacDermid, 1996), we investigate some antecedents and consequences of SWFB. Especially, corresponding to a recent call for more investigations on workplace-side antecedents of SWFB (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011), we look into family-supportive paid leave and supervision, the two widely accepted formal and informal initiatives promoting an employee’s work-family balance (Major & Litano, 2016). Moreover, we examine organizational citizenship behavior directed to the supervisor (OCBS) as an SWFB’s behavioral outcome in addition to affective organizational commitment as its attitudinal outcome.

Second, another unique feature of this study is investigation of whether employees react differently to family supports depending on their perceived insider status, defined as a cognitive assessment of relative standing in an organization and conceptually distinct from affective organizational commitment (Lapalme, Stamper, Simard, & Tremblay, 2009). Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) suggests that people react positively to an organization that determines their self-identity and assign more value to what the organization offers them. Perceived insider status is one’s self-identity specific to an organization to which one belongs (Masterson & Stamper, 2003; Stamper & Masterson, 2002). Then, employees can take different stances toward family supports available in the workplace to achieve SWFB depending on the level of perceived insider status. Hence, this study regards perceived insider status as a boundary condition that can alter the effects of family support on an employee’s SWFB.

Third, our moderated mediation model depicted in Figure 1 is tested in Korea. Korean employees generally spend long work hours at the workplace (OECD Stat, 2015), implying that the features of workplace will have a significant impact on their work and family lives. Thus, Korea is an appropriate empirical setting in which to examine the workplace-side antecedents and consequences of SWFB. Our findings from the Korean context therefore can contribute to an improved understanding on SWFB around the globe, particularly by focusing on its workplace-related antecedents and consequences.

-----------------------------------

Insert Figure 1 about here
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In sum, the principal contribution of this study is to demonstrate not only the mediation of SWFB in the relationships between workplace family supports and affective organizational commitment and OCBS, but also variation in these mediational linkages depending on perceived insider status. Korean organizations where employees spend the majority of their time serve as a pertinent empirical setting for our research examining workplace-related antecedents and consequences of SWFB, which provide unique insights into the work-family balance research.

**Theoretical Development and Hypotheses**

**SWFB: A Role Balance Theory Perspective**

Work-family researchers using a balance approach have often relied on role balance theory (Aryee, Srinivas, & Tan, 2005; Greenhaus et al., 2003). The theory argues that people are predisposed to be engaged in various roles by allocating their personal resources, such as time, skills, energy, and commitment, and eventually pursue a balance among these multiple roles. Role balance refers to the state in which individuals juggling multiple roles perform every typical role in their whole role system with full attentiveness and care (Marks & MacDermid, 1996). The core principle of the theory is predicated on role enhancement (Sieber, 1974) and expansion (Marks, 1977). Both perspectives advocate that caring about roles in one life domain yields positive spillover across diverse domains and ultimately results in increased performance, enhanced status, and improved self-contentment in those domains. Hence, by engaging in diverse roles, individuals are more likely to enjoy various positive results, such as overall well-being (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Marks & MacDermid, 1996), rather than being exhausted mentally and physically.

According to role balance theory, employees should pursue a balance between work and family lives (Greenhaus et al., 2003). Valcour (2007) proposed the construct of SWFB to refer to an emotional reaction to cognitive appraisal of overall effectiveness in striking a balance between work and family responsibilities. Thus, SWFB describes a cognitive and an affective aspect of employee performance in the work and family interface. The *cognitive* aspect indicates employees’ assessments of the investment of their personal resources in both domains, and the *affective* aspect refers to emotional feelings resulting from their efforts and overall effectiveness in both spheres (Marks & MacDermid, 1996). Such an approach to SWFB that focuses on overall effectiveness in both domains, adopted in this study, is in sharp contrast to the component approach (Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007) that identifies specific constituents (e.g., conflict, facilitation, or enrichment) of work-family balance.

SWFB is distinct and value-added beyond some existing constructs in the work-family interface. It is not a work-family linking mechanism, but rather a unitary, holistic construct (Greenhaus et al., 2003; Valcour, 2007). For instance, work-family conflict, facilitation, and enrichment are all cross-domain constructs, portraying the transfer processes through which experiences in one role affect the quality of experiences in the other role. In contrast, SWFB denotes an overall contentment occurring when an individual successfully fulfills role expectations in the work and family domains, having no concern with directionality between the two domains (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Valcour, 2007). SWFB therefore has its own utility in accounting for work and non-work outcomes beyond the existing work-family constructs (Grawitch et al., 2013). Thus, it is worthwhile to investigate how SWFB is shaped and affects employee outcomes, especially given that research on this construct is still in the early stages.

**Antecedents of SWFB: Family-Supportive Paid Leave and Supervision**

Organizations and immediate supervisors play a critical role in offering formal and informal family support to employees (Allen, 2001; Major & Litano, 2016). This study examines paid leave assistance for dependent care and family emergencies as an organizational formal benefits program for work-family balance. It is one of the most widely available programs not only in many Western countries (Allen, 2001; Lambert, 2000), but also in the Eastern context (Lee & Kim, 2010). We particularly focus on the actual use of this program rather than its availability, because the use of this support depends on employees’ needs for family support (Major & Litano, 2016) and directly affects their experiences in the work and family domains (Frye & Breaugh, 2004; Rothausen, 2016).

We postulate a positive relationship between the use of family-supportive paid leave and SWFB. Employees can achieve SWFB by effectively fulfilling both work and family roles (Greenhaus et al., 2003; Valcour, 2007). To do so, they need to distribute their personal resources across work and family domains (Kirchmeyer, 2000), as role balance theory argues. The use of family-supportive paid leave enables employees to effectively allocate personal resources and thus to pay full attention to work and family roles, eventually resulting in an overall contentment from the successful role accomplishment in both settings (Marks & MacDermid, 1996). That is, giving employees paid opportunities to leave the workplace temporarily to discharge family responsibilities, after which they return to the workplace with a positive experience in the family domain, allows them to concentrate on work and ultimately feel satisfied with their work-family balance. Previous studies (McNamara et al., 2013; Valcour, 2007) have reported a negative linkage between work hours and SWFB. This evidence implies that employees working for short hours can allocate more psychological and physical resources to family role performance, thereby ultimately achieving SWFB. It is plausible then that the use of family-supportive paid leave helps employees reallocate work hours to family care and consequently enhances their SWFB. Thus,

**Hypothesis 1.** The use of family-supportive paid leave is positively related to employee SWFB.

Next, on the informal side, family support from immediate supervisors facilitates employees’ SWFB. Family-supportive supervisors exercise discretion to satisfy employees’ rapidly increasing needs for work-family balance (Major & Litano, 2016) that cannot be met readily by formal benefits. They offer family-supportive supervision through emotional support, instrumental support, and role modeling (Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner, & Hanson, 2009).

We contend that family-supportive supervision is influential to employees’ positive experiences in the work-family interface. Family-supportive supervisors offer to subordinates various psychological and physical resources necessary to perform family roles. For instance, by allowing a subordinate to adjust work conditions depending on his/her family situation, they enable the subordinate to utilize more time and energy to accommodate family responsibilities. In addition, employees under family-supportive supervisors experience less stress when taking care of family demands, because they are less afraid of the flexibility stigma—the bias against those who seek flexibility in work arrangements leading to significant career penalties such as low performance appraisals (Vandello, Hettinger, Bosson, & Siddiqi, 2013), which prevents many employees from freely using formal family-supportive benefits. This line of reasoning suggests that family-supportive supervision leads to SWFB. Thus,

**Hypothesis 2.** Family-supportive supervision is positively related to employee SWFB.

**Consequences of SWFB: Affective Organizational Commitment and OCBS**

According to the role enhancement and expansion perspectives of role balance theory (Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974), the benefits from effective involvement in multiple roles outweigh costs because involvement in one role can contribute to performance in other roles. Marks and MacDermid (1996) found that individuals with balanced role systems experience positive outcomes in multiple roles and overall well-being. Consistent with this theory and evidence, work-family balance research has also demonstrated that expanding commitment to both work and family responsibilities generates positive outcomes in both domains because enhanced skills and positive experiences gained in one domain can be utilized in the other domain (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000).

This study examines an employee’s attitude and behavior as workplace-related outcomes of SWFB. Specifically, we focus on affective organizational commitment—an individual’s emotional attachment to the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991)—as an attitudinal outcome of SWFB, since employees who benefit from formal family-supportive programs will highly likely display positive attitudes to the organization. On the other hand, OCB is an individual’s discretionary behavior that is not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system but promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1997). We pay special attention to OCBS as a behavioral outcome of SWFB to examine how supervisors themselves benefit from their own family-supportive supervision. Although supervisors have long been acknowledged as a key source of family support, very little is known about whether their family-supportive behavior positively impacts them.

Working in a family-supportive organization and having a family-supportive supervisor enable employees who pursue work-family balance to have a positive feeling about their effectiveness at achieving balance. When reaching SWFB, employees are strongly motivated to contribute to the prosperity of the organization and the supervisor supporting their work-family balance. To do so, employees reveal strong psychological commitment to the welfare of their organization and are willing to assist when their family-supportive supervisor needs help. In this regard, enhanced affective organizational commitment and increased OCBS will be elicited from employees who experience SWFB and thereby wish to reciprocate. Thus,

**Hypothesis 3.**SWFB is positively related to employee a) affective organizational commitment and b) OCBS.

Previous research has indicated that family-supportive workplace characteristics are positively related to affective organizational commitment (Allen, 2001) and OCB (Lambert, 2000). Our previous discussion implies the mediating role of SWFB in these relationships. In other words, SWFB connects organizations’ and supervisors’ family supports to affective organizational commitment and OCBS. Thus,

**Hypothesis 4.**The use of family-supportive paid leave is positively related to employee a) affective organizational commitment and b) OCBS through the mediation of SWFB.

**Hypothesis 5.** Family-supportive supervision is positively related to employee a) affective organizational commitment and b) OCBS through the mediation of SWFB.

**A Boundary Condition for the Mediational Process: Perceived Insider Status**

Although workplace family supports intend to help employees balance work and family roles, those supports might be accepted differently among employees (Lambert, 2000). We propose that individuals adopt different stances to family supports depending on their social identity. In fact, some studies (e.g., Aryee & Luk, 1996) have relied on social identity theory to emphasize the importance of one’s self-concept to work-family experiences. In particular, it was found that an employee with strong work identity—the importance placed on work as a self-conception dimension—eventually experiences positive affective benefits across work and family domains (Wayne, Randal, & Stevens, 2006). As such, several previous studies have recognized the main effect of work identity on work and family experiences.

Taking a further step, we argue that employees’ reactions to family supports offered by an organization and a supervisor can depend on the degree of their work identity. We pay special attention to perceived insider status as a dimension of work identity since it denotes one’s self-perception based on the relationship between an employee and an organization (Masterson & Stamper, 2003). In contrast to organizational commitment, which describes an individual’s affective attachment to an organization as a whole, perceived insider status relates to an individual’s perceived importance or identity defined in terms of relative standings in an organization. Based on social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), this study proposes that perceived insider status as work identity can alter the linkages from family-supportive workplace characteristics to affective organizational commitment and OCBS through SWFB. More specifically, we argue that employees with high perceived insider status will experience more SWFB when using family-supportive paid leave and supervision than those with low perceived insider status, thereby reciprocating with affective organizational commitment and OCBS for two reasons.

First, insiders are likely to attach more value to the family-supportive treatments from an organization and a supervisor than are outsiders. As social identity theory argues, individuals display positive attitudes to the organization with which they strongly identify and more positively assess what they gain from the organization. This indicates that insiders who strongly identify with their organizations will acknowledge positive features of family-supportive paid leave and supervision. As these insiders appreciate family supports more than outsiders, they will utilize the supports more frequently and effectively. On the other hand, since outsiders fail to recognize the real value of family supports, they are less likely to use the supports effectively, which might hinder them from gaining positive experiences in the work-family interface. Therefore, family-supportive paid leave and supervision will contribute more to work-family balance of insiders than to that of outsiders.

Second, insiders with high social standings in their organizations tend to feel entitled to more privileges, such as family supports offered by an organization and a supervisor. Therefore, they feel more comfortable utilizing those family supports to the fullest extent, which in turn generates the initially intended benefits. Eventually, family supports will enable them to successfully function in work and family domains, resulting in enhanced SWFB. In contrast, outsiders who perceive low social standings in their organization are more concerned about the risk that the use of family supports might be interpreted negatively. Such a strong fear of flexibility stigma (Vandello et al., 2013) causes them to hesitate to utilize family supports or even deters them from utilizing the supports at all. Then, it is possible that family supports offered by an organization and a supervisor cannot produce the originally intended benefits to the full extent, indicating that the supports contribute less to the SWFB of outsiders.

In summary, although the family supports are available to all employees in an organization, insiders will gain more positive emotional experiences from balanced family and work lives by using those supports. Thus,

**Hypothesis 6.**The indirect effect of the use of family-supportive paid leave on employee a) affective organizational commitment and b) OCBS through SWFB is stronger when perceived insider status is higher.

**Hypothesis 7.**The indirect effect of family-supportive supervision on employee’ a) affective organizational commitment and b) OCBS through SWFB is stronger when perceived insider status is higher.

**Method**

**The Korean Context**

We tested our hypotheses in the Korean context, where the proposed moderated mediation processes of SWFB might be more noticeable. In contrast to the Western individualistic culture, the Eastern collectivistic culture, including Korea, maintains a “family-based work ethic” (Yang, Chen, Choi, & Zou, 2000), in which work is viewed as a key vehicle to support family welfare (Redding, 1993). Extra work after official work hours or on weekends in Korea is not a sacrifice of family for the sake of one’s career, but rather self-sacrifice for the benefit of family. Furthermore, Korean employees with a strong loyalty-to-the-employer norm (Powell et al., 2009) are willing to accept surprisingly long work hours (OECD Stat, 2015). Therefore, the features of workplace have a significant impact on how Korean employees function in the work and family domains. This suggests that Korean organizations are an appropriate setting in which to test our research model focusing on the workplace-side antecedents and outcomes of SWFB.

**Sample and Procedure**

We collected data from employee-supervisor dyads in 12 organizations in the public sector and three private sectors (i.e., manufacturing, finance, and service) in Korea. The original sampling frame was 300 employee-supervisor dyads, drawing from a list of working parents and their supervisors compiled by human resource managers of the participating organizations. Each employee completed a survey about the use of family-supportive paid leave, family-supportive supervision, perceived insider status, SWFB, and affective organizational commitment. Each supervisor rated his/her designated subordinates’ OCBSs in a separate survey. Both surveys were matched using code numbers. In total, 240 matched surveys were returned, resulting in a response rate of 80%.

Taking into account the focus on working parents and their use of paid leave, we excluded respondents without children under 18 years old and those with no access to family-supportive paid leave.[[1]](#footnote-1) Thus, 118 independent employee-supervisor dyads were included in the final analysis. Among 118 employee respondents, 77% were male. Their average age, average organizational tenure, and average tenure with the current supervisor were 39.51, 12.64, and 3.23 years, respectively. Their average work hours per week were 46.69 hours, and 57% reported having a working spouse. Job groups varied: 28% in administrative/secretary positions, 31% in technical positions, 10% in professional positions, 23% in managerial positions, and 8% others. Of the 118 supervisors, 91% were male, their average age was 45.64 years, and their average organizational tenure was 18.47 years.

**Measures**

We measured all variables with items already well-established in the existing literature. The Korean version of the measures was created following the backward translation procedure of Brislin (1986). Unless otherwise specified, all items were measured on a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree).

*The use of family-supportive paid leave.* We collected employees’ responses on three items (α = .91) to assess how often they used paid leave for (1) child rearing, (2) nursing sick family dependents, and (3) dealing with family emergencies. Employees rated each item on a 5-point scale (1 = never; 5 = very often).

*Family-supportive supervision*. Employees rated Thomas and Ganster’s (1995) seven items (α = .93) on a 5-point scale (1 = never; 5 = very often) to assess their immediate supervisor’s family-supportiveness. Sample items included “How often has your immediate supervisor switched your schedule (overtime hours, vacation) to accommodate your family responsibilities?” and “How often has your immediate supervisor listened to your problems in combining work and family responsibilities?”

*Perceived insider status*. Employee perceived insider status was measured by six items (α = .88) from Stamper and Masterson (2002). Sample items included “I feel very much a part of my work organization” and “My work organization makes me believe that I am a valued participant.”

*SWFB.* Employees completed Valcour’s (2007) five items (α = .94) on a 5-point scale (1 = very dissatisfied; 5 = very satisfied) to indicate their SWFB. Sample items included “How satisfied are you with the way you divide your time between work and personal or family life?” and “How satisfied are you with your ability to balance the needs of your job with those of your personal or family life?”

*Affective organizational commitment.* We measured affective organizational commitment with Meyer and Allen’s (1991) five items (α = .93). Sample items included “I would be happy to spend the rest of my career or working life in this organization” and “I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside of it.”

*OCBS.* Each supervisor rated his/her designated employees’ OCBSs. We used Rupp and Cropanzano’s (2002) five-item measure (α = .91), which modified Williams and Anderson’s (1991) original measure for OCB beneficial to specific individuals. Sample items were “Assists you with your work when not asked” and “Helps you when you have a heavy workload.”

*Control variables.* We controlled for respondents’ family situations (i.e., spouse employment status and number of children under 18 years old), work situations (i.e., organizational tenure and tenure with the current supervisor), and some demographic information (i.e., gender, education, and age). Prior work-family balance research (Aryee et al., 2005; Valcour, 2007) demonstrated that those variables affect an employee’s experiences in the work and family domains.

**Analyses**

We tested our moderated mediation model in two steps. First, we conducted multiple regression analyses to investigate the antecedents and consequences of SWFB. Next, we performed a conditional process modeling analysis (Hayes, 2013) to test the moderated mediation model. This analysis was based on moderated path analysis with nonlinear bootstrapping (Hayes & Preacher, 2013; Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007). The results of this analysis provided estimates of the indirect effects of the independent variables (i.e., family-supportive paid leave and supervision) on the dependent variables (i.e., affective organizational commitment and OCBS) through the mediating variable (i.e., SWFB) at various levels of the moderating variable (i.e., perceived insider status) using a bootstrapping confidence interval (CI). For the significance test of conditional indirect effects, if the 95% CI around the indirect effects did not contain zero at a certain level of the moderator, it indicates that the indirect effect was significant at that level of the moderator.

**Results**

**Descriptive Statistics and Correlations**

The means, standard deviations, and correlations of the variables are presented in Table 1. As predicted, SWFB was positively correlated with the two antecedents and the two outcomes. Family-supportive supervision was positively related to both outcomes, but the use of family-supportive paid leave was positively associated only with affective organizational commitment.

Interestingly, some significant correlations reflected the distinct features of Korean workplaces. For instance, gender was negatively correlated with age (*r* = -.36) and organizational tenure (*r* = -.20), implying that many Korean females tend to work while young but quit their jobs after marriage and childbirth (Draudt, 2016). These results likely stem from a strong gender role ideology in Korea that prescribes the different roles of the two genders. Furthermore, many Korean firms tend to hire low educated females for “pink-collar” jobs (e.g., secretary work), resulting in a negative gender-education correlation (*r* = -.26).

-----------------------------------

Insert Table 1 about here

------------------------------------

Despite the conceptual distinction (Lapalme et al., 2009), there was a high correlation (*r* = .69) between perceived insider status and affective organizational commitment. We conducted confirmatory factor analysis to test the discriminant validity of the two constructs. More specifically, the analysis compared our hypothesized six-factor model with a five-factor model in which we combined perceived insider status and affective organizational commitment into a single factor. The hypothesized six-factor model produced acceptable fit indexes (*χ2*= 731.52, *df* = 419, *p* < .001, RMSEA = .08, NNFI = .96, CFI = .97). On the other hand, fit indexes of the five-factor model were *χ2* = 904.12, *df* = 424, *p* < .001, RMSEA = .10, NNFI = .94, CFI = .95. The result of a significant chi-square difference between the two models (*Δχ2* = 172.6, *Δdf* = 5, *p* < .001) indicated that the hypothesized six-factor model has a better fit than the five-factor model. Despite the high correlation between the two constructs, multicollinearity is not a serious concern here, because no employee-reported variables had a variation inflation factor value greater than 10 (Belsley, Kuh, & Welsch, 1980). All of these results support the analysis of our hypotheses with the hypothesized six-factor model.

**Testing the Hypotheses**

Model 2 in Table 2 showed that the use of family-supportive paid leave (β = .20, *p* < .05) and family-supportive supervision (β = .46, *p* < .001) were positively related to SWFB, thus supporting Hypotheses 1 and 2. In addition, SWFB was positively associated with both affective organizational commitment (β = .55, *p* < .001, in Model 4) and OCBS (β = .28, *p* < .01, in Model 5). This evidence supports Hypotheses 3a and 3b.

-----------------------------------

Insert Table 2 about here
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In order to test Hypotheses 4 and 5 regarding the mediating role of SWFB, we examined whether the indirect effect of SWFB was significant with 10,000 bootstrap samples (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). As seen in Table 3, the indirect effect of the use of family-supportive paid leave on affective organizational commitment through SWFB was significant (*ab* = .03, 95% CI: .001, .08), while its indirect effect on OCBS through SWFB was not significant (*ab* = .03, 95% CI: .00, .10). Consequently, Hypothesis 4a was supported, but Hypothesis 4b was not. In contrast, the indirect effects of family-supportive supervision on both affective organizational commitment (*ab* = .05, 95% CI: .01, .14) and OCBS (*ab* = .06, 95% CI: .004, .17) through SWFB were significant, which supported Hypotheses 5a and 5b.[[2]](#footnote-2)

-----------------------------------
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Finally, following the moderated mediation test procedure recommended by Muller, Judd, and Yzerbyt (2005), we first conducted regression analyses to ascertain the significance of the interaction between the independent variables and the moderator on the mediator before testing Hypotheses 6 and 7. As presented in Model 3 of Table 2, perceived insider status did not moderate the relationship between the use of family-supportive paid leave and SWFB (β= -.05, *ns*), while its moderating effect on the relationship between family-supportive supervision and SWFB was significant (β= .21, *p* < .05). Therefore, the subsequent conditional process modeling analysis was conducted to test only Hypotheses 7a and 7b. Using the process modeling macro (Hayes, 2013), we tested the indirect effects of family-supportive supervision contingent on specific values of perceived insider status (e.g., 1 SD above and below the mean). As reported in Table 4, the indirect effect of family-supportive supervision on affective organizational commitment through SWFB was significantly different from zero and positive among those with high (*ab* = .18, 95% CI: .07, .34) and moderate (*ab* = .10, 95% CI: .03, .22) levels of perceived insider status. The same results were found for the indirect effect of family-supportive supervision on OCBS through SWFB when perceived insider status was high (*ab* = .09, 95% CI: .004, .23) and moderate (*ab* = .05, 95% CI: .002, .16). However, for those with low perceived insider status, the indirect effects of family-supportive supervision on affective organizational commitment (*ab* = .02, 95% CI: -.08, .12) and OCBS (*ab* = .01, 95% CI: -.03, .10) through SWFB were not significantly different from zero. These results supported Hypotheses 7a and 7b.

-----------------------------------
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**Discussion**

We found that family-supportive paid leave and supervision were positively related to SWFB, and SWFB was positively related to affective organizational commitment and OCBS. Furthermore, SWFB mediated the linkages from family-supportive supervision to affective organizational commitment and OCBS and the linkage from family-supportive paid leave to affective organizational commitment. Finally, the entire mediational process for family-supportive supervision depended on perceived insider status, while the same pattern was not found for the mediational process related to family-supportive paid leave.

**Theoretical Implications**

This study contributes to the literature on the work-family interface in several ways. First, this study enriches our understanding of SWFB, which is a recently emerging construct in the literature. Most previous studies on SWFB (McNamara et al., 2013; Valcour, 2007) have identified its antecedents mostly defined in terms of job characteristics. However, very little is known about whether the workplace features that significantly influence employees’ lives are related to SWFB. We focused on family-supportive paid leave and supervision as two influential workplace features and found that they both contribute to employee SWFB. In addition, while previous studies on SWFB (Grawitch et al., 2013) have exclusively investigated the attitudinal outcomes of SWFB, we examined its behavioral outcome (i.e., OCBS) as well. It was found that employees who are satisfied with work-family balance engage in citizenship behavior for their family-supportive supervisor. Future research needs to investigate more antecedents and consequences of SWFB for a more complete understanding.

Next, one of the most novel insights gained from this study is to incorporate perceived insider status into the work-family interface research. Some previous studies (Aryee & Luk, 1996; Wayne et al., 2006) have emphasized the importance of self-identity to an individual’s experiences in the work and family domains, and our study adds more empirical evidence to this argument. It is intriguing that there exists a strong positive correlation between perceived insider status and SWFB. That is, the perception of being included by the organization is closely related to an overall positive experience in both work and family domains, implying that social acceptance in the workplace leads employees to successfully fulfill work and family responsibilities. More importantly, we also found that the role of family-supportive supervisors in eliciting employee affective organizational commitment and OCBS through SWFB was more salient for those with high perceived insider status. We offer some speculations on why insiders felt more satisfied with their balanced experiences in the work and family domains. First, consistent with the premise of social identity theory, insiders regard family supports granted by their supervisor more positively and thus use the support more effectively than outsiders. Second, insiders feel less concerned about the flexibility stigma in utilizing family supports to the fullest extent. As a result, insiders more successfully perform work and family responsibilities with family supports by their supervisors, which will enhance SWFB. Although we found the moderating effect of perceived insider status in the Korean context, this moderating role might not be confined only to this context. As long as employees in other contexts, including Western countries, consider work identity in the form of perceived insider status, our theoretical logic to elaborate on the moderating role of perceived insider status will be applicable to them as well. Future research on other potential moderators (e.g., actual job performance and job value) of these relationships can enhance our understanding on the inter-individual variation of SWFB.

The same pattern of the moderated mediational process was not evident for family-supportive paid leave. This result could stem in part from the inherent feature of the family-supportive benefits program. The standard paid leave benefits, by nature, cannot be customized for insiders and outsiders in terms of its specific content and format. In addition, family-supportive paid leave cannot be given preferentially to insiders. In this sense, a formal family-supportive benefits program is less likely to be recognized as a privilege to insiders and thus is not able to promote insider SWFB above that of outsiders. Our results, however, should not be interpreted to mean that organizational benefits programs are less effective than supervisors as a source of family support, because this study focused only on the paid leave program. It would be informative if future research examined the moderated mediational process proposed here with a set of more diverse family-supportive benefits.

Interestingly, we failed to find supportive evidence of the mediating role of SWFB in the relationship between family-supportive paid leave and OCBS. In contrast, SWFB mediated the linkage between family-friendly supervision and affective organizational commitment. This finding seems consistent with some previous studies (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002) reporting that employees tend to generalize their perceptions about the supervisors to the organizations, but not the other way. In other words, because employees tend to regard their supervisors as a key agent of the organization, the supervision style affects employee reactions to the organization. However, it seems that employees do not necessarily engage in OCBS merely because the organization provides family-supportive benefits program.

Another important contribution of this study is the demonstration that supervisors themselves benefit from their own family-supportive supervision. Most previous studies have reported that employees benefit from their supervisor’s family-supportive supervision, for example, with less work-family conflict (Michel, Kotrba, Mitchelson, Clark, & Baltes, 2011). However, whether supervisors themselves also benefit from their own family-supportive supervision has not been previously examined. We found that employees under family-supportive supervisors had a positive affective experience (i.e., SWFB), which eventually leads them to engage in more OCBS. Therefore, family-supportive supervision brings benefits not only to employees, but also to supervisors themselves. In the sense that OCB improves recipient productivity (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997), one possible direction of future research is to investigate whether family-supportive supervision enhances supervisor task performance.

Lastly, our findings with a sample of Korean employees complement the existing work-family balance research based mostly on Western evidence (for an exception, see Aryee et al., 2005). An employee’s desire for work-family balance is a global issue, and family-friendly practices are expanding around the globe. This study found that family-supportive paid leave as a formal support and family-friendly supervision as an informal support contributed to SWFB of Korean employees. Although they are two of the most representative practices to promote work-family balance of Western employees (Allen, 2001; Major & Litano, 2016), it was unknown whether they are also effective practices in non-Western contexts. We found that these two types of family supports help Korean employees to successfully perform family role responsibilities and thereby experience SWFB. Our research is among the first to investigate the workplace-side antecedents and consequences of SWFB in a non-Western context. Future research in other non-Western contexts will enrich our understanding of SWFB determinants.

**Limitations**

As with other studies, this study has some limitations. First, we presented a moderated mediational process of SWFB, but our cross-sectional research design is not an ideal approach to test such a causal process model. Therefore, future research needs to employ a longitudinal research design to better test the moderated mediational model.

Second, employees rated all variables except OCBS, which might raise some concerns about common method bias. However, this practice of data collection is widely used in research on the work-family interface, because collecting data from multiple sources on this sensitive topic is challenging (Aryee et al., 2005; Valcour, 2007). We also tried to alleviate the common method bias concern with some procedural preventions, including asking supervisors to rate employee OCBS. Furthermore, common method bias cannot explain the significant moderating effect of perceived insider status (Evans, 1985). Nonetheless, subsequent research should replicate our theoretical model with multi-source datasets.

Third, this study focused only on family-supportive paid leave as an organizational benefit. In addition, omitting family-side variables in antecedents and outcomes of SWFB limits a comprehensive understanding of SWFB. Future research needs to include other family-supportive workplace benefits and various family-related influences (e.g., spousal support). Furthermore, given that SWFB is a strong motivator for many employees, we encourage researchers to extend this field of study to more distal outcome variables at work (e.g., task performance) and overall life satisfaction.

**Practical Implications**

This study provides some practical implications. First, SWFB plays an important role in employee attitudes and behaviors, which ultimately contribute to organizational effectiveness. Since family-supportive initiatives offered by an organization and a supervisor are critical in facilitating employee SWFB, organizations should incorporate formal and informal work-family integration practices into their talent management system.

Second, our results clearly demonstrate the importance of supervisors in helping employees to strike a balance between work and family responsibilities. Many organizations are not able to implement large-scale, expensive family-supportive benefits (e.g., flexible work arrangement and child care) due to cultural reasons, limited resources, or lack of capital. In such a situation, supervisors’ informal roles in providing family support become more critical (Bagger & Li, 2014). Moreover, this study found a positive interaction between family-supportive supervision and perceived insider status on SWFB and, in turn, on work-related outcomes. This finding emphasizes the value of discretionary family support from supervisors in retaining and motivating valuable employees (i.e., insiders) by addressing their concerns about effective fulfillment of work and family roles. Therefore, organizations need to train their supervisor so that they can deliver more informal and flexible family support (Hammer et al., 2011).

Finally, our findings imply that outsiders appear to less effectively utilize family supports provided by their organization and supervisor than insiders. Since they feel that they are not well accepted by their organization and cannot readily utilize family supports, they can suffer from double difficulties in the work and family domains. Managers need to show consideration to outsiders by offering some opportunities to enhance their acceptance within the organization. For instance, assigning more suitable jobs to them and enhancing their competence for job performance will help them feel included in the organization. As noted by the expansion-enhancement logic of role balance theory, one’s effectiveness at work can facilitate his/her roles even in the family domain, thereby promoting satisfaction with overall life.
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Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics and Correlations*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | M | S.D. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| 1. Spouse employment status a | .57 | .50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Number of children under 18 years old | 1.57 | .66 | -.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Gender b | .23 | .42 | .48 | -.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Age | 39.51 | 6.57 | -.13 | .10 | -.36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Organizational tenure | 12.64 | 7.04 | -.15 | .23 | -.20 | .69 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Tenure with current supervisor | 3.23 | 3.33 | -.06 | -.07 | -.11 | .15 | .10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Education level c | 2.53 | .88 | -.11 | .12 | -.26 | -.09 | .02 | -.10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Use of family-supportive paid leave | 2.99 | 1.01 | .08 | .00 | .01 | .06 | .05 | -.02 | .00 | (.91) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Family-supportive supervision | 4.05 | .69 | .16 | .11 | .02 | .11 | .01 | -.04 | .21 | .33 | (.93) |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Perceived insider status | 4.10 | .69 | .23 | .11 | .07 | .20 | .17 | -.08 | .12 | .30 | .65 | (.88) |  |  |  |
| 11. SWFB | 3.62 | .81 | .01 | .11 | -.11 | .20 | .10 | -.10 | .11 | .35 | .54 | .61 | (.94) |  |  |
| 12. Affective organizational commitment | 3.91 | .78 | .13 | .19 | .07 | .19 | .10 | -.05 | .03 | .29 | .52 | .69 | .58 | (.93) |  |
| 13. OCBS | 4.20 | .66 | .18 | .06 | .08 | .01 | -.05 | .03 | .05 | .15 | .26 | .15 | .28 | .12 | (.91) |

*Note*. *N* = 118; |r| > .30, *p* < .001; |r| > .23, *p* < .01; |r| > .18, *p* < .05.

SWFB = Satisfaction with work-family balance; OCBS = Organizational citizenship behavior directed to the supervisor.

a 0 = not employed and 1 = employed.

b 0 = male and 1 = female.

c 1 = high school, 2 = vocational college, 3 = undergraduate, and 4 = graduate degree.

Table 2

*Regression Results*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Satisfaction with  work-family balance | | | | | | | |  | Affective organizational commitment | |  | OCBS | |
|  |  | Model 1 | |  | Model 2 (H1&2) | |  | Model 3 | |  | Model 4 (H3a) | |  | Model 5 (H3b) | |
| Age |  | .29 | \* |  | .14 |  |  | .09 |  |  | .18 |  |  | .06 |  |
| Gender |  | -.04 |  |  | -.08 |  |  | -.11 |  |  | .17 |  |  | .06 |  |
| Organizational tenure |  | -.11 |  |  | -.03 |  |  | -.09 |  |  | -.06 |  |  | -.11 |  |
| Tenure with current supervisor |  | -.12 |  |  | -.11 |  |  | -.08 |  |  | .02 |  |  | .09 |  |
| Number of children under 18 years old |  | .09 |  |  | .05 |  |  | .05 |  |  | .13 |  |  | .06 |  |
| Spouse employment status |  | .06 |  |  | -.03 |  |  | -.08 |  |  | .07 |  |  | .16 |  |
| Education |  | .11 |  |  | -.01 |  |  | -.02 |  |  | .03 |  |  | .06 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use of family-supportive paid leave |  |  |  |  | .20 | \* |  | .18 | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family-supportive supervision |  |  |  |  | .46 | \*\*\* |  | .23 | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satisfaction with work-family balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .55 | \*\*\* |  | .28 | \*\* |
| Perceived insider status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .49 | \*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use of family-supportive paid leave × Perceived insider status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family-supportive supervision × Perceived insider status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .21 | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *R2* |  | .09 |  |  | .36 |  |  | .50 |  |  | .40 |  |  | .13 |  |
| *F* |  | 1.49 |  |  | 6.87 | \*\*\* |  | 8.74 | \*\*\* |  | 8.91 | \*\*\* |  | 2.01 | \*\*\* |
| *ΔR2* |  |  |  |  | .28 |  |  | .14 |  |  | .28 |  |  | .07 |  |
| *F for ΔR2* |  |  |  |  | 23.57 | \*\*\* |  | 9.48 | \*\*\* |  | 50.46 | \*\*\* |  | 8.91 | \*\* |

*Note*. *N* = 118; Standardized coefficients are reported.

OCBS = Organizational citizenship behavior directed to the supervisor.

*\*p* < .05; *\*\*p* < .01; *\*\*\*p* < .001.

Table 3

*Mediation Analysis of SWFB with Bootstrapping (Hypotheses 4 and 5)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indirect effects | Unstandardized coefficient | | *SE* | 95% confidence interval | |
| Lower limit | Upper limit |
| Use of family-supportive paid leave → SWFB → Affective organizational commitment | .03 | \* | .02 | .001 | .08 |
| Use of family-supportive paid leave → SWFB → OCBS | .03 |  | .02 | .00 | .10 |
| Family-supportive supervision → SWFB → Affective organizational commitment | .05 | \* | .03 | .01 | .14 |
| Family-supportive supervision → SWFB → OCBS | .06 | \* | .04 | .004 | .17 |

*Note*. *N* = 118; Bootstrap sample size = 10,000.

SWFB = Satisfaction with work-family balance; OCBS = Organizational citizenship behavior directed to the supervisor.

*\**Significant indirect effect (i.e., the confidence interval does not include zero.) at *p* < .05

Table 4

*Conditional Indirect Effects of Family-Supportive Supervision on Affective Organizational Commitment and OCBS through SWFB (Hypothesis 7)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dependent variable | Moderator  (Perceived insider status) | Conditional  indirect effect  (*ab*) | | *SE* | 95% confidence interval |
| Affective organizational  commitment | High | .18 | \* | .07 | [.07, .34] |
| Moderate | .10 | \* | .05 | [.03, .22] |
| Low | .02 |  | .05 | [-.08, .12] |
| OCBS | High | .09 | \* | .06 | [.004, .23] |
| Moderate | .05 | \* | .04 | [.002, .16] |
| Low | .01 |  | .03 | [-.03, .10] |

*Note*. *N* = 118.

OCBS = Organizational citizenship behavior directed to the supervisor; Hayes’s (2013) recommendation was adopted to analyze the moderated mediation model with two independent variables, such that one is an independent variable, while the other is a control variable, and vice versa.

*\**Significant indirect effect (i.e., the confidence interval does not include zero.) at *p* < .05

Satisfaction with work-family balance

Affective organizational commitment

Organizational citizenship behavior directed to supervisor

Use of family-supportive paid leave

Perceived insider status

Family-supportive supervision

*Figure 1.* A moderated mediation model of satisfaction with work-family balance.

1. Following Allen’s (2001) two categories (i.e., flexible work arrangements and dependent care supports) of the family-supportive organizational benefits, we initially attempted to collect information on the availability and use of various family-supportive organizational benefits, and only 118 working parents in the final sample indicated that three forms of family-supportive paid leave were available to them. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Our bootstrapping analysis found the non-significant direct effects of workplace family supports on work outcomes. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)