



IMPACT OF FAMILY SUPPORTIVE SUPERVISOR BEHAVIOUR'S AND WORK ENGAGEMENT ON WORK- FAMILY CONFLICT OF POLICE PERSONNEL

Aahana Saha^{1*}, Dr Rubina Anjum², Dr D J Singh³

Abstract:

Current research study investigates the impact of family supportive supervisor behavior and work engagement on work-family conflict among police personnel. Work-family conflict is a prevalent issue in the law enforcement sector, affecting the well-being and performance of police officers. This study aims to contribute to the existing literature by investigating the relationships between family supportive supervisor behaviour's, work engagement, and work-family conflict using a quantitative approach. The study utilizes a survey questionnaire administered to a sample of police personnel in Punjab, India, collecting data on their perceptions of family-supportive supervisor behavior, work engagement levels, and the extent of work-family conflict experienced. Quantitative data analysis techniques like multiple regression analysis and descriptive statistics like mean, media mode, are employed with the help of SPSS 23 to examine the associations between the variables and determine the predictive power of family-supportive supervisor behavior and work engagement on work-family conflict. Findings of the present cross-sectional study reveal that family supportive supervisor behaviour's and work engagement negatively predicted the work-family conflict among the police personnel in Punjab, India.

Keywords: Work-family conflict, family-supportive supervisor behavior, work engagement, police personnel, survey questionnaire, data analysis

^{1*}Research Scholar, CT University

²Assistant Professor, CT University

³Professor, CT University

***Corresponding Author:** Aahana Saha

*Research Scholar, CT University

DOI: 10.48047/ecb/2023.12.si5a.0576

Introduction

Family supportive supervisor behaviours are the certain behaviors and attitudes of superiors towards their subordinates that can help promoting a balance between the personal and professional life among the subordinates. Family-friendly supervision has emerged as an essential component that must be present in order to achieve successful work–family integration and to ensure the wellbeing of workers (Straub, 2012). Approximately 60 papers have researched family-supportive supervisor behaviour's (FSSB) during the previous three decades, with one-third of them emerging in the last three years (Crain & Stevens, 2018). Family supportive supervisor behaviors can also be conceptualised as the actions or attitudes of one's supervisors that are perceived as family supportive and are believed to support the family responsibilities of their employees. The Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviour's approach has been shown to have significant positive effects on employee performance, behaviour, and well-being (LI et al., 2023). Family supportive supervisors can engage in a number of key behaviours. Supervisors can first provide flexible work schedules and provisions to facilitate employees' family obligations. This includes providing adjustable time schedule, allowing working from home or remote work options, and allowing employees to take leaves or reduced workloads when needed (Wayne et al., 2007). These behaviours are essential for establishing a positive and supportive work environment, which can boost employee well-being and job satisfaction (Hammer et al., 2011). Supervisors can improve overall well-being of employees; Supervisors can also create a sense of balance between work and family life of an employee. There are empirical evidences that engaging in supportive behaviors can contribute to a positive organisational atmosphere and may contribute to higher retention, output, and organisational success as a whole (Wayne et al., 2007). It is generally agreed upon that supervisors play an essential part in the workplace, both in terms of the experiences they provide for their subordinates and the outcomes that are achieved by their organisations. When supervisors display empathy, and provide support to employees in balancing work and family responsibilities, employees experience less stress and greater psychological wellness (Eby et al., 2005). This leads to a healthier workplace and increased employee satisfaction overall. When supervisors show this understanding that they are aware of their employees' family needs and help them find a good mix between their professional

and personal lives, employees feel more loyal and connected to the organisation (Kossek et al., 2001) FSSBs are comprised of a variety of deeds, policies, and attitudes that are demonstrated by supervisors in order to make it easier for their subordinates to balance their work and family responsibilities. Talukder, (2019) investigated the relationship between supervisor support and work-family conflict among Australian financial sector employees. Findings, of the study revealed supervisor support is inversly associated to work-family conflict. Hammer et al., (2005) did a study on how family supportive supervisor behaviours affect the correlation between work-family conflict and job related outcomes, such as work engagement. They found that family supportive supervisor behaviours buffered the negative impact of work family conflict on work engagement. This meant that workers whose managers were family supportive were more engaged at work. Carlson et al., (2006) examined the relationship between family supportive supervisor behaviors and engagement among workers. The results demonstrated a positive correlation between family-supportive supervisor behaviours and employee engagement. Employees who perceived greater support from their superiors in balancing work and family exhibited greater work engagement. Bakker et al., (2008) investigated the influence of family-supportive supervisor behaviours in predicting employee engagement. Results indicated that family supportive supervisor behaviours positively predicted employee work engagement. Higher levels of work engagement were related to supportive supervisor behaviours, such as offering flexible work schedule and comprehending work family conflicts. Hammer et al. (2009) investigated the impact of family-supportive supervisor behaviours on employee engagement and discovered a significant positive correlation. The study revealed that supervisors who demonstrated comprehension, provided support, and accommodated employees' family requirements were more likely to foster greater levels of employee engagement.

Work Engagement or Employee engagement is a psychological state characterised by high levels of vigour, commitment, and immersion in one's work. It reflects an optimistic and rewarding work experience that transcends job satisfaction. Due to its positive effects on both individuals and organisations, work engagement has attracted a great deal of attention in organisational research. Several studies have looked at the connection

between work engagement and different job resource and demands. These studies have shed light on the things that help or hurt work engagement. Social support has been positively associated to work engagement as an essential employment resource.

Xanthopoulou et al., (2009), for instance, demonstrated that social support from supervisors and coworkers positively predicted employee engagement at work. Social support equips individuals with the resources and motivation necessary to effectively manage job demands while maintaining an elevated level of work engagement. Control or autonomy over one's work has also been linked to work engagement. Bakker et al., (2014) found an association between job control and work engagement in their study. Employees with a greater perception of control over what they do at work and decision-making are more likely to be engaged at work. Moreover, job stress or negative elements of the workplace can have an impact on work engagement. Halbesleben & Wheeler, (2008) investigated the association between job strains and work engagement in their study. They discovered a negative relationship between high job demands, such as excessive burden and time strain, and work engagement. Such demands may drain employees' vitality and inhibit their ability to devote themselves to their work in full measure. Overall, research indicates that both workplace resources and job strains influence work engagement. Job resources, like perceived social support and job autonomy, are related to higher levels of work engagement, whereas job strains, like intense job demands and work family conflict, can have a negative influence on work engagement. Bakker & Demerouti (2007) explored how job resources affect work engagement in healthcare employees with work engagement. Results of the study revealed that there is a positive relationship between job resources like supervisor support and work engagement. Schaufeli & Bakker (2004) examined how job demands and resources predict work participation in several industries. Work engagement was adversely correlated with workload and time constraint. Social support, autonomy, and performance feedback were linked to work engagement. Saks, (2006) examined how role ambiguity and conflict affect work engagement. Job pressures significantly impacted work engagement. Role ambiguity and disagreement decreased job engagement. Lavanika et al., (2023) in their study on service sector employees in India concluded that work engagement is negatively related to job strains like

work family conflict and positively related to resources like perceived supervisor support. Saha, (2023) in their study on college teachers in India revealed a negative correlation between turn over intention and work engagement. The results of the study also revealed a positive correlation between supervisory support and job satisfaction. Work engagement is impacted by a variety of circumstances, including work-family problems, and is described as a good and gratifying work-related condition characterised by high levels of enthusiasm and devotion.

Work-family conflict is a type of inter-role conflict that happens when the demands of job and family duties are incompatible with one another (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Work-family conflicts arise when the demands and duties of the work and family domains collide, posing difficulties in managing both. Several research have been conducted to investigate the link between work engagement and work-family conflicts, in order to shed light on the influence of these conflicts on job engagement. Bakker et al., (2009) discovered that work-family conflicts were adversely associated to job engagement. Employees who reported higher levels of work-family conflict reported lower levels of job engagement. Wayne et al., (2004) discovered that work-family conflicts were related to lower levels of job engagement. Individuals who had difficulty resolving work-family issues reported lower job engagement, according to the research. Findings show that work-family disputes might operate as roadblocks to job engagement, possibly draining employees' energy and reducing their capacity to fully participate in their work. Furthermore, Carlson et al., (2011) investigated the moderating effect of supervisor support in between work-family conflicts and job engagement. According to the results of this study, supervisor support mitigated the unfavourable impact of work-family disputes on job engagement. Employees who sensed greater amounts of supervisor support reported better levels of job engagement, even when work-family issues were present. Wayne et al., (2004) investigated the influence of work-family conflicts on job engagement. Job-family conflicts were found to be adversely connected with work engagement. Employees who reported greater degrees of work-family conflict acknowledged lower levels of job engagement. Bakker et al., (2009) reported that work-family conflicts were related to lower levels of job engagement. Individuals who had difficulty resolving work-family issues reported lower job

engagement, according to the research. Guglielmi et al., (2012) revealed a negative association between work-family conflicts and job engagement in another study. Furthermore, ten Brummelhuis & Bakker (2012) explored the long-term association between work-family conflicts and job engagement. Job-family conflicts were found to have a negative impact on job engagement, and lower levels of work engagement predicted increasing work-family conflicts over time. These findings show that conflicts between work and family might operate as obstacles to job engagement, possibly exhausting the vitality of employees and reducing their capacity to engage completely in their work. However, the presence of supportive supervisors can help alleviate the negative impact of work-family conflicts and increase job engagement among workers. The findings also revealed that there is scarcity of the research pertaining to the police personnel when it comes to the availability of social or organizational support. Research repeatedly suggests that informal workplace supports, such as family supportive supervisor behaviours (FSSB), are more effective than formal organisational supports at minimising work-family conflict (Yu et al., 2022).

India's federal structure plays a very much important role in establishing the structure of state police forces. Each state and union territory in India is having its own police force, which is under the control of the state or union territory only. This decentralised method allows for state-specific law enforcement system to prevail in the states or union territories.

State Police:

The State Police are in charge of law enforcement at the state level. Each state has its own police force, called the State Police, which is led by a Director General of Police (DGP). The DGP is the highest-ranking police officer in the state and is in charge of the general management, direction, and control of the state police force (Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, 2006).

District Police:

The base level of law enforcement in India is the district police. Each district is led by a Superintendent of Police (SP), who is responsible for keeping law and order, stopping and uncovering crimes, and assuring the safety of the public within the district (Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, 2006). Although State police personnel in India are very important to keeping law and order intact in the state and district

levels, but they often have to work in places that are hard and stressful. Because of the nature of their jobs, they face many psychological difficulties that can affect their mental health, performance and productivity. research have highlighted state police personnel in India are at risk getting disorders like post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) because they have been exposed to stressful events. Sahoo et al. (2019) also found that the stress of police work was linked to higher rates of depression and worry among cops. (Verma & Mukhopadhyay, 2020) have found that drug abuse and addiction are major problems in the police force. The suicide rates among state police personnel in India are also something which is worrisome.

Understanding the overall wellbeing of state police personnel is important if we want to create successful strategies, interventions and support systems to improve their overall wellbeing and ability to bounce back. In recent years, there has been a rising acknowledgment of the value of family supportive supervisor behaviours, often known as FSSBs, in encouraging work-life balance and providing assistance for employees who have family obligations. Police personnel often find it hard to balance their work responsibilities with their personal and family lives because their jobs are so demanding. The importance of family supportive supervisor behaviours in police organisations is getting more attention as a key factor in improving the overall wellbeing of police personnel, and also enhances the effectiveness of the organisation. Available literature has already highlighted that family supportive supervisor behaviours have a positive effect on staff well-being, balance between life and work, satisfaction with work, and job performance (Aryee et al., 2011). Although, family supportive supervisor behaviours have been a well researched topic around the world in different organizational settings, surprisingly there is scarcity of research examining the impact of family-supportive supervisor behaviours on India's state police forces. The distinctive nature of police work, including work shifts, long working hours, and witnessing critical incidents, necessitates a closer examination of the supervisory role in promoting the health and balance between work and family life of police personnel. Understanding the impact of family-supportive supervisor behaviours in the Indian context is essential for the development of programs and interventions that will increase overall efficiency and contentment of police personnel.

The unique and demanding nature of police work in India makes investigating Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviours (FSSB), work engagement, and work-family conflict relevant. Due to their vocation, police officers have significant job stress, lengthy, unpredictable work hours, and difficult work-family balance. Understanding how FSSB, work engagement, and work-family conflict connect in this environment might impact police well-being and performance. Studying the associations between FSSB and job engagement might reveal how supportive police supervisors can boost employee engagement. Supervisors who provide flexibility, recognise work-family problems, and give tools for work-family balance may boost work engagement, job satisfaction, dedication, and well-being among police personnel. FSSB, work engagement, and work-family conflict in police employees must be understood to design interventions and policies that improve their well-being and performance of police personnel. Thus, investigating FSSB, job engagement, and work-family conflict among Indian police personnel is crucial to addressing their particular issues and enhancing their well-being and performance in their demanding duties.

Objectives:

1. To investigate the relationship between family supportive supervisor behaviors and work-family conflict among police personnel in India.
 - This objective aims to explore the extent to which Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviors predicts levels of work-family conflict among police personnel.
2. To examine the relationship between work engagement and work-family conflict among police personnel in India.
 - This objective aims to explore the extent to which Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviors predicts levels of work-family conflict among police personnel.
3. To provide practical recommendations for organizations and supervisors within the police force to enhance Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviors, work engagement, and reduce work-family conflict among police personnel in India.
 - This objective aims to offer evidence-based suggestions and strategies for organizations and supervisors to improve FSSB, promote work engagement, and reduce work-family conflict among police personnel.

Hypothesis:

H_{A1} Family supportive supervisor behaviors will negatively predict work-family conflict among police personnel in India.

H_{A2} Work engagement will negatively predict work-family conflict among police personnel in India.

Methodology:

Research Design:

An Ex-post facto research design will be used to carry out the current research.

Participants:

Current study will include a sample of 115 state police personnel from various police stations of Jalandhar, Punjab. Sample size is established using relevant statistical procedures.

Sampling:

Simple random sampling method is used to while extracting the representative sample from the study population with the help of self reported questionnaires

Tools:

- Family supportive supervisor behaviours (FSSB) 14: Family supportive supervisor behaviours tool will be used to assess family supportive behaviours of supervisors. This scale is used worldwide and is having a satisfactory reliability and validity (Hammer et al. 2009).
- Work-family conflict scale (WAFCS): This tool will assess the work family conflict on a 7 point likert scale. This is a 10 item scale given by Haslam et al., (2015).
- UWES9: Utrecht work engagement scale will be used to assess the levels of work engagement. This is a 9 item scale and will assess the work engagement on 7 point likert scale given by (Schaufeli, et al., 2006).

Procedure:

- All the ethical consideration will be followed during the course of research.
- Informed consent will be taken from the participants
- Depending on the practical considerations and preferences of the participants, data will be collected using online surveys, in-person interviews, or a combination of the two.
- Participants will be given explicit instructions on how to complete the questions, and they will have the option of doing so anonymously.

Data Analysis:

- Data analysis will be done with the help of SPSS-23
- Descriptive statistics will be calculated to examine the demographic characteristics of the participants and the distribution of variables.
- Regression analysis will be conducted to explore the relationships between FSSB, work engagement, and work-family conflict.
- Control variables, such as age, gender, rank, and years of service, may be included

Results and Discussion:

Table 1 Demographic characteristics

Category	Sub-category	Frequency
Age	20-30 years	33%
	31-40 years	45.2%
	41-50 years	21.7%
	Total	115
Gender	Female	22.6%
	Male	77.3%
	Total	115
Years of Service	Less than 5 years	10.4%
	5- 10 years	67.8%
	10-15 years	21.8%
	Total	115

Table 1 show the population characteristics where 33% of the sample population falls in the age group of 20-30, whereas 45.2% sample population falls in the age group of 31-40 years. Furthermore, 21.7% of the population is falling in the age group of 41-50 years. As far as gender is concerned there are only 22.6% female police personnel whereas

males constitute 77.3% of the total sample. 10.4% of the sample population has served the police department for less than 5 years, whereas 67.8% have served the said organization in the bracket of 5 to 10 years. Furthermore 21.8% have been working in the department for more than 10 years to less than 15 years.

Table 2 Descriptive statistic

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
FSSB	115	20.00	70.00	45.4087	13.50692
Work engagement	115	18.00	49.00	34.8174	8.83433
Work family conflict	115	10.00	64.00	30.6174	16.21651

Table 1 Shows the mean, scores of family supportive supervisor behaviour's M= 45.40, while standard deviation is SD=13.5 and the mean score of work engagement, M= 34.8 and standard

deviation is SD=8.83. Furthermore, work -family conflicts are having the mean score M= 30.61 and standard deviation is SD=16.2.

Table 2 Regression co-efficient for family supportive supervisor behaviour's and work engagement on work-family conflicts.

Variable	B	SE	t	p	95% CI
Work-family conflict	83.601	3.365	24.845	.000	[76.9,90.2]
FSSB	-.643	.088	-7.265	.000	[-.818,-468]
WE	-.683	.135	-5.051	.000	[-.951,-415]

Note. CI=Confidence Interval

Table 2 shows the impact of Family supportive supervisor behaviour's and work engagement on work family conflict of police personnel. The R² value of .71 revealed that the predictors explained 71% variance in the outcome variable with F (2,112) = 141.667 p<001. Result of the study demonstrated that family supportive supervisor behaviour's negatively predicted the work-family conflict of police personnel ($\beta = -.64$ p<.001).

Furthermore work engagement also predicted the work-family conflict of police personnel ($\beta = -.6$ p<.001. Hence hypotheses H_{A1} states that "Family supportive supervisor behaviors will negatively predict work-family conflict among police personnel in India" stand accepted. The results are in line with the literature review where (Ode-Dusseu et al., 2016) investigated the impact of family supportive supervisor training on employee

work performance and attitudes. Employees reported less work-family conflict following the training, demonstrating that family supportive supervisor can have a favourable influence on work-family conflict. Kossek et al. (2011) carried out a meta-analysis to determine the impact of general and work-family-specific supervisor and organisational support on work-family conflict. They observed the two types of supports i.e. general as well as specific were inversely associated with work-family conflict, indicating that family supportive supervisor behaviour's can aid in the reduction of work-family conflict. Bagger & Li (2014) investigated the association between supervisor support, work-family conflict, and well-being in a longitudinal research. They discovered that greater amounts of supervisory support, including family supportive supervisor behaviour's, were linked to reduced levels of work-family conflict over time, resulting in improved employee well-being. Several research studies have looked at the influence of job engagement on work-family conflict, emphasising its role in mitigating or buffering the negative impacts of work-family conflict. Brummelhuis et al. (2012) using a sample of healthcare workers, investigated the association between job engagement and work-family conflict. High levels of work engagement were shown to be connected with reduced levels of work-family conflict. According to the authors, engaged employees are better able to disengage from work and engage in meaningful family activities, resulting in less conflicts between work and family. Furthermore, Hakanen et al., (2018) conducted research on the function of work engagement as a mediator in the link between job resources and work-family conflict. Work engagement demonstrated a moderating effect in the relationship between job resources like supervisor support and work-family conflict. This shows that when people are more engaged at work, they are more likely to see it as a beneficial resource, which can lessen conflicts between work and family obligations. Work-life conflict and work engagement have been studied in depth, providing insight on their interconnectivity. Several studies have identified a negative relationship between job engagement and work-life conflict (Bhave et al., 2019; Greenhaus et al., 2019). Although, authors did not found any of the research paper on state police in Indian context. Recent research has looked at the link between family supportive supervisor behaviours, job engagement, and work-family conflict, demonstrating how they are all interconnected. Kossek et al. (2020), for example, discovered that

family supportive supervisor behaviours were positively connected with work engagement. Employees who reported higher levels of job engagement reported higher levels of assistance from their superiors in managing their family commitments. This implies that when managers are sympathetic and tolerant of their workers' family concerns, it might increase their involvement at work.

Recommendations and implications:

Improving work-family balance: Police professionals frequently encounter rigorous work schedules and high levels of professional stress, which can contribute to work-family disputes. Police organisations may assist enhance work-family balance among their people by supporting family supportive supervisor behaviours such as giving flexible work arrangements or acknowledging family obligations. As a result, police personnel may experience less stress and higher levels of satisfaction.

Enhancing work engagement: Work engagement can be improved by family-friendly supervisors. Supervisors who accommodate family demands can boost workers' devotion, enthusiasm, and focus. Police performance, job satisfaction, and well-being can improve with increased work engagement.

Retention and decreased turnover: Work-family issues can cause burnout and work discontent, which may raise turnover intentions in police personnel. Police organisations may enhance retention and minimise turnover by supporting family-friendly supervisors and encouraging work engagement. This can make community police personnel more skilled and devoted.

Organisational commitment: Police personnel who feel their superiors support their family obligations are more loyal to the organisation. Family-friendly supervisors show that the organisation cares for its employees, which boosts loyalty and commitment towards the work and inturn increases the work engagement.

Limitations: Studying impact of family supportive supervisor behaviours and work engagement on work-family conflict of police personnel gives essential insights, but there are certain limitations too, first, the current research has adopted a cross-sectional designs, making causality and connection dynamics difficult to determine. Self-reporting measures has been used

to collect the data for the current study which can add different biases to the reporting. Lack of consideration into reciprocal interactions is not taken care properly.

Reverse causation may also affect family-supportive supervisor behaviours. Reciprocal interactions would deepen understanding. To address these constraints, researchers can explore adopting a variety of study methodologies, objective metrics, data collection from many sources, performing studies in different contexts, and controlling for important variables. These techniques would improve the findings' validity and generalizability.

References:

1. Bagger, J., & Li, A. (2014). Supervisor support, work-family conflict, and well-being: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 19*(2), 168-181.
2. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Burke, R. (2009). Workaholism and relationship quality: A spillover-crossover perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14*(1), 23–33. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013484>
3. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Dollard, M. F. (2008). How job demands, resources, and burnout predict work engagement: A multifactorial approach. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 23*(3), 309–326. <https://doi.org/10.1108/0268394081086943>
4. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD–R approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1*, 389–411. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091235>
5. Bhave, D. P., Glomb, T. M., & Oishi, S. (2019). The psychology of occupational well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology, 70*, 243–271.
6. Carlson, D. S., Grzywacz, J. G., Ferguson, M., Hunter, E. M., & Clinch, C. R. (2011). Support, undermining, and work-family conflict: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79*(1), 270–281. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.01.004>
7. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.02.002>
8. Crain, T. L., & Stevens, S. C. (2018). Family-supportive supervisor behaviors: A review and recommendations for research and practice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39*(7), 869–888.
9. Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980-2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*(1), 124–197.
10. Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs. (2006). Police in India. Retrieved from https://mha.gov.in/sites/default/files/PoliceIndia_27092017.pdf
11. Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs. (2020). Police reforms. Retrieved from https://mha.gov.in/sites/default/files/PoliceReforms_01012020.pdf
12. Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review, 10*(1), 76–88.
13. Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2019). Work engagement: A review and agenda for future research. In R. J. Burke & K. M. Page (Eds.), *Research handbook on work engagement* (pp. 1-18). Edward Elgar Publishing.
14. Guglielmi, D., Avanzi, L., Chiesa, R., & Mariani, M. G. (2012). Work-family conflict, positive spillover, and affective well-being. *Psychology, 3*(5), 402–409. <https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2012.35057>
15. Hakanen, J. J., Peeters, M. C., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2018). Different types of employee well-being across time and their relationships with job crafting. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 23*(3), 289–301.
16. Halbesleben, J. R., & Wheeler, A. R. (2008). The relative roles of engagement and embeddedness in predicting job performance and intention to leave. *Work & Stress, 22*(3), 242–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802379412>
17. Hammer, L. B., Cullen, J. C., Neal, M. B., Sinclair, R. R., & Shafiro, M. V. (2005). The longitudinal effects of work-family conflict and positive spillover on emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*(1), 58–68. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.1.58>
18. Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Anger, W. K., Bodner, T., & Zimmerman, K. L. (2011).

- Clarifying work-family intervention processes: The roles of work-family conflict and family-supportive supervisor behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 134-150. doi:10.1037/a0020927
19. Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Bodner, T., & Zimmerman, K. L. (2009). Clarifying work-family intervention processes: The roles of work-family conflict and family-supportive supervisor behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5), 1345–1357. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017599>
 20. Kossek, E. E., Colquitt, J. A., & Noe, R. A. (2001). Care giving decisions, well-being, and performance: The effects of place and provider as a function of dependent type and work-family climates. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1), 29-44.
 21. Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L. B. (2011). Workplace social support and work-family conflict: A meta-analysis clarifying the influence of general and work-family-specific supervisor and organizational support. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(2), 289-313.
 22. Kossek, E. E., Piszczek, M. M., McAlpine, K., Hammer, L. B., Burke, L. M., & Almeida, D. M. (2020). Workplace social support and work engagement among US workers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 122, 103470.
 23. Lavanika, S., Baloria, M. A. S., & Verma,(2023). M. K. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FAMILY SUPPORTIVE SUPERVISOR BEHAVIORS WORK FAMILY CONFLICTS AND WORK ENGAGEMENT. *Eur. Chem. Bull.* **2023**, 12 (Special Issue 5), 4238 – 4243
 24. LI, C., MENG, X., XU, Y., & LAN, Y. (2023). Effects of family supportive supervisor behavior on employee outcomes and mediating mechanisms: A meta-analysis. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 55(2), 257.
 25. Odle-Dusseau, H. N., Hammer, L. B., Crain, T. L., Bodner, T. E., & Kelly, E. L. (2016). The influence of family-supportive supervisor training on employee job performance and attitudes: An organizational work-family intervention. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21(3), 296-308.
 26. Saha, A. (2023). Relationship Between Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviours and Job Outcomes. *Vidhyayana-An International Multidisciplinary Peer-Reviewed E-Journal-ISSN 2454-8596*, 8(si6), 289-305.
 27. Sahoo, S., Subramanian, S., & Kumar, P. (2019). Predictors of post-traumatic stress disorder among police personnel in India. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 61(Suppl 4), S735-S741.
 28. Straub, C. (2012). Antecedents and organizational consequences of family supportive supervisor behavior: A multilevel conceptual framework for research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 22(1), 15-26.
 29. Talukder, A. M. H. (2019). Supervisor support and organizational commitment: The role of work-family conflict, job satisfaction, and work-life balance. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 56(3), 98-116.
 30. Ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). A resource perspective on the work-home interface: The work-home resources model. *American Psychologist*, 67(7), 545–556. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027974>
 31. Ten Brummelhuis, L. L., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). The job demands-resources model: The mediating role of psychological capital. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(3), 324-336.
 32. Verma, R., & Mukhopadhyay, S. (2020). Substance use and suicide: A brief overview. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 62(Suppl 2), S242-S247.
 33. Wayne, J. H., Grzywacz, J. G., Carlson, D. S., & Kacmar, K. M. (2007). Work-family facilitation: A theoretical explanation and model of primary antecedents and consequences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 17(1), 63-76. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2006.11.002
 34. Wayne, J. H., Musisca, N., & Fleenon, 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. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(03\)00035-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00035-7)
 35. Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82(1), 183–200. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317908X285633>
 36. Yu, A., Pichler, S., Russo, M., & Hammer, L. (2022). Family-supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB) and work-family conflict: The role of stereotype content, supervisor gender, and gender role beliefs. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 95(2), 275-304.