



RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FAMILY SUPPORTIVE SUPERVISOR BEHAVIORS WORK FAMILY CONFLICTS AND WORK ENGAGEMENT.

S.Lavanika^{1*}, Mr. Arjun Singh Baloria², Dr. Manish Kumar Verma³

Abstract:

Purpose: As the globalization has brought about a significant change in the way private organizations are operating. Service sector employees are emerging as most vulnerable workforce to be exposed to various work place hazards like workplace bullying, work family conflicts, stress to meet deadline and many more. Employee well-being today is of utmost importance today not only for the betterment of employee but for the effectiveness of the organization too. Family supportive supervisor behaviors can work as a trainable resource at workplace and help employees to deal with negative effects of workplace strains by increasing positive aspect of workplace. This study aims to explore the relationship between family supportive supervisor behaviors work family conflicts and work engagement. The study also aims to determine the effect of family supportive supervisor behaviors on work family conflicts and work engagement.

Methodology: An ex post facto research design is used in this study. A total of 112 employees working in service sector of various private organizations have been recruited as participants for the current study. Simple random sampling technique was employed to collect the data through the standardized questionnaires. The data was analyzed using statistical techniques correlation and regression and with the help of spss 21.

Findings: Results of the study revealed a significant positive relationship between family supportive supervisor behaviors and work engagement. Other findings of the study revealed a significant negative correlation between family supportive supervisor behaviors and work to family and family to work conflict. There was also a significant negative correlation between work engagement and work to family and family to work conflict. Results also reveal that family supportive supervisor behaviors positively predicted work engagement while work to family and family to work conflict didn't significantly predicted work engagement.

Key word: Employee well-being, Family supportive supervisor behaviors, Work engagement, work to family conflict, family to work conflict

^{1*}Master in Clinical Psychology, Department of Psychology, Lovely Professional University, Punjab India, Email- lavanika.sai12@gmail.com

²Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Lovely Professional University, Punjab India

³Professor, Department of Psychology, Lovely Professional University, Punjab India

***Corresponding author:** S. Lavanika

*Master in Clinical Psychology, Department of Psychology, Lovely Professional University, Punjab India, Email- lavanika.sai12@gmail.com

DOI: - 10.48047/ecb/2023.12.si5a.0326

INTRODUCTION

Family supportive supervisor behaviors

Supervisors who demonstrate family-friendly behaviors play a crucial role in encouraging workers to strike a healthy work-life balance. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) state that the extent to which an individual is equally involved in and satisfied with his or her work role and family role is the definition of work-family balance. Establishing work-family balance is crucial because it can decrease stress, boost happiness at work, and boost loyalty to the company (Kossek, Hammer, Kelly, & Moen, 2014). Family-supportive supervisor behaviors are those that manager's exhibit towards their subordinates in order to help them balance their professional and personal lives (Higgins, Duxbury, & Irving, 1992).

Examples of this kind of conduct include being open to employees' schedule requests, instituting generous leave policies, and exhibiting compassion and understanding for the responsibilities that employees have at home (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Positive outcomes for both employees and businesses have been linked to supervisors who are supportive of their personal lives (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Hammer, Kossek, Anger, Bodner, & Zimmerman, 2011). Studies have shown that companies that help their workers find a good work-life balance have happier, more loyal workers (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000). That's why it's so important for businesses to foster an environment that encourages and rewards supervisory practices that are accommodating of employees' needs at home.

Companies that invest in their employees' happiness and health see a positive return on investment in the form of higher output and greater loyalty to the company. Flexible work arrangements can be managed by changing the time and/or place of work as needed" (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998, p. 142). This can mean giving employees the option to change their work schedules or work from home. Support for family time can be provided by letting employees take time off to take care of family responsibilities or take part in activities related to family (Hammer et al., 2011, p. 137), letting them use sick leave to take care of family, or letting them go to school events for their children. Providing emotional support like, supervisors can show empathy, understanding, and interest in the personal lives of their employees (Hammer et al., 2011, p. 138). This can include listening to employees' worries, showing that you understand the responsibilities

they have at home, and giving emotional support during times of stress. The way supervisors act is a good example of how to balance work and family life. This can be done by supervisors using flexible work schedules, taking time off for family responsibilities, and showing that they value the family responsibilities of their employees (Hammer et al., 2011).

Work engagement:

Work engagement is a psychological state defined by vigour, determination, and absorption that displays a good, gratifying, work-related mindset (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002). Work engagement has three dimensions, according to (Bakker and Demerouti 2008): vigour, which originally referred to elevated levels of energy and mental strength while continuing to work; dedication, which necessitates a robust feeling of involvement and relevance in one's work; and absorption, which identifies an employee being totally absorbed and focused on one's work tasks. Employee and business success are both enhanced when workers are emotionally invested in their jobs. Managers and companies may do more to improve employee well-being and productivity by gaining a better understanding of the elements that lead to employee engagement at work. Work engagement has been linked to a variety of good outcomes, including increased job satisfaction (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), improved work performance (Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2005), and reduced absenteeism (Halbesleben, Buckley, & Sauer, 2004).

Furthermore, work engagement has been demonstrated to be a predictor of staff retention and customer satisfaction (Saks, 2006). Engagement in one's work can be influenced by a number of different things (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009). Job demands (such as workload and time pressure) and job resources (such as social support and autonomy) are hypothesised to affect employee engagement on the job (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Employees are more likely to be invested in their jobs if they feel valued, have access to resources, and have some control over their work (Bakker & Albrecht, 2018). So, an operational definition of work engagement could be that it is a psychological state that is marked by vigour, dedication, and absorption in activities related to work (Schaufeli et al., 2002).. The phrase "high degree of energy and mental resilience while working" is one definition of the term "vigour" (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008, p. 211). A "strong sense of

participation, excitement, and significance towards one's work" is one way to operationalize what we mean when we talk about dedication (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008, p. 212). Absorption can be defined as "being entirely immersed and engaged on one's job activities, such that time seems to pass quickly and one loses track of external stimuli. Lastly, absorption can be understood as a state where an employee is fully immersed and focused on his/her work tasks (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008, p. 213).

Work-family conflict

The term "work-family conflict" refers to the tension that develops in an individual as a result of the individual's work and family responsibilities rubbing up against one another (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). This kind of conflict can manifest in a number of different forms, such as time-based conflict, strain-based conflict, or behavior-based conflict (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). Time-based conflict occurs when job and family obligations conflict with each other (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). For instance, a working parent may have to work late and miss their child's after-school activities. Strain-based conflict occurs when job expectations flow over into another domain, causing tension and stress (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). For instance, a stressful work may impair family relationships. Behavior-based conflict develops when two roles need contradictory behaviors (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). For instance, a person who must be assertive and competitive at work may struggle to be caring and supporting at home. When an individual's obligations to their job and their family become at odds with one another, a condition known as work-family conflict (WFC) arises (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). There are two ways to think about WFC: (1) as a case of work interfering with family obligations (WIF) and (2) as a case of family interfering with work obligations (FIW) (Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrin, 1996). When "work and family duties are mutually incompatible in some sense such that involvement in one role is made more difficult by engagement in the other," as defined by Grzywacz and Marks (2000), we have work-family conflict (WFC). This definition emphasizes the idea that problems emerge when the needs of one domain make it difficult to meet the needs of another area. WFC is "a sort of inter-role conflict in which the role constraints from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some sense," as Byron (2005) puts it. This description highlights the idea that WFC results from a mismatch between work and family

responsibilities. Overall we can say that Work-family conflict (WFC) is a type of interpersonal conflict that arises when an individual's commitments to their career and their home life are at odds with one another.

Objective of the study

- To investigate the relationship between family supportive supervisor behaviors and work engagement.
- To investigate the relationship between family supportive supervisor behaviors and work family conflict.
- To investigate the relationship between work engagement and work family conflict.

Hypothesis:

- H1 family supportive supervisor behavior will be positively correlated with the work engagement.
H2 family supportive supervisor behavior will be negatively correlated with the work to family conflicts
H3 family supportive supervisor behavior will be negatively correlated with family to work conflicts
H4 work engagement will be negatively correlated with the work to family conflicts.
H5 work engagement will be negatively correlated family to work conflicts

Methodology

An ex post facto research design is used in this study. A total of 112 employees working in service sector of various private organizations have been recruited as participants for the current study. Simple random sampling technique was employed to collect the data through the standardized questionnaires. The data was analyzed using statistical techniques correlation and regression and with the help of spss 21.

Variable

Predictor: Family supportive supervisor behaviors and work family conflicts.

Dependent: Work engagement

Research design:

An ex post facto research design is used for the current study.

Research participants

Participants were recruited using a simple random method. There were cases where employees working in different companies taking part in the study were sent questionnaires through whatsapp and face book. Participants of the studies were service sector employees from different private

firms in Hyderabad, India. Only the employees working in service sector were taken as participants because of the nature of the present study.

Tools:

- FSSB will be assessed with a 14-item measure by (Hammer et al. 2009). The measure includes four subscales: emotional support (four items; sample, 'My supervisor takes the time to learn about my personal needs'), instrumental support
- The Work and Family Conflict Scale developed by Haslam, D., Filus, A., Morawska, A., Sanders, M. R., & Fletcher, R. (2015). The work-family conflict scale (WAFCS): Development and initial validation of a self-report measure of work-family conflict for use with parents.
- Work Engagement will be assessed with UWES-9 (Schaufeli, Baker & Salanova, 2006). UWES-9 contains three subscales; Vigor, dedication and absorption. Three items each assess each dimension for example for dedication is an item —I am enthusiastic about my job and for absorption —I am immersed in my work and for vigor —At my job, I feel bursting with energy respondents answered on a 7-point scale ranging from=never to 6=always Cronbach's alpha for this measure was .91.

Results and discussions

TABLE 1:-Description of respondents with respect of Age, Gender and Qualification.

Category	Sub category	Frequency
Age	20-40 years	97%
	41-60 years	3%
	Total	112
Gender	Female	70.3%
	Male	29.7%
	Total	112
Qualification	Undergraduates	11%
	Graduate	58.2%
	Post Graduate	30.8%
	Total	112

Table 1 demonstrates the frequency distribution and percentage of participants depending on demographic factors such as age, gender, qualification. Out of 112 service sector employees Majority 97% of participants between the age group of 20-40 years, followed by 3% between the age of 41-60 years. 70.3% Employees were female and 29.7% were male. The percentage of employees in qualification area was undergraduates 11%, graduates 58.2% and post graduates are 30.8%.

TABLE 2:-Mean difference in work engagement, "family supportive supervisor behaviors", and work to family conflicts and family to work conflicts

Descriptive Statistics			
VARIABLES	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
WE	37.6667	7.83252	112
FSSB	48.6111	10.13360	112
WTOF	16.3111	6.79664	112
FTOW	14.2778	6.63160	112

Table 1 demonstrates the mean, scores for work engagement M= 37.66 whereas standard deviation is SD=7.835 and the mean score for family supportive supervisor behaviors, M= 48.611 whereas standard deviation is SD=10.133 and the mean score for M=16.311 whereas standard deviation is SD=6.796 work to family conflicts and the mean score M= 14.277 family to work conflicts whereas standard deviation is SD=6.631 based on the demographic variables: age, gender and qualification.

TABLE 3:-Relationship of family supportive supervisor behaviors, work to family Conflicts and family to work conflict, work engagement.

Variable	FSSB	WTOF	FTOW	WE
FSSB	1	-.385**	-.561**	.543**
WTOF		1	.624**	-.372**
FTOW			1	-.382**
WE				1

Note - **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 demonstrates the correlation matrix among family supportive supervisor behaviors, work to family conflicts and family to work conflict, work engagement. The finding showed that family supportive Supervised behaviors was negative correlated with work to family conflicts (r = -.385, p < .01), and with family to work conflicts (r = -.561, p < .01) family structured supervisor behaviors are positively correlated with work engagement (r = .543, p > 0.01) work to family conflicts is positively correlated to family to work conflicts (r = .624, p > 0.01) and negatively correlated to work engagement (r = -.372, p < 0.01) family to work conflicts is negatively correlated to work engagement (r = -.382, p < 0.01). Several studies have investigated the relationship between FSSB and work-family conflict, and have found that FSSB is negatively related to work-family conflict (Matthews & Barnes-Farrell, 2010; Hammer et al., 2013). For example, in a study of nurses, Matthews and Barnes-Farrell (2010) found that FSSB was negatively related to work-family conflict, and that this relationship was mediated by job satisfaction. Similarly, Hammer and colleagues (2013) found

that FSSB was negatively related to work-family conflict in a sample of information technology employees. These findings suggest that supervisors who exhibit family supportive behaviors can help to reduce work-family conflict and its negative outcomes. Therefore, interventions aimed at increasing FSSB may be effective in promoting employee well-being and organizational outcomes. Multiple studies have found a negative correlation between FSSB and work-family conflict (Matthews & Barnes-Farrell, 2010; Hammer et al., 2013), with one study of nurses finding that FSSB was a mediator between job satisfaction and work-family conflict. These results imply that supervisors who model family-friendly actions can mitigate the detrimental effects of work-family conflict. Therefore, initiatives that aim to boost FSSB could improve worker satisfaction and productivity. Kossek et al., (2011) discovered that employees who had higher levels of family demands also had a stronger negative association between FSSB and work-family conflict. Family-supportive supervisory behaviour (FSSB) has been shown to increase employee enthusiasm for their jobs (Hammer et al., 2013; Matthews & Barnes-Farrell, 2010). Hammer, et al. (2013) observed that among IT workers, FSSB was positively associated to job engagement, with the connection between the two being mediated by work-family enrichment. Matthews and Barnes-Farrell (2010) also discovered that FSSB was positively connected to work engagement, with the latter being mediated by the former through feelings of contentment in one's employment. Several other studies have found a connection between FSSB and dedication to one's job. For instance, Park et al. (2014) observed that among hotel workers, FSSB was positively associated to work engagement, with the connection between the two being mediated by employment resources. Similarly, Kinnunen et al. (2014) found that in the public sector, FSSB was positively associated to work engagement, with the connection between the two being at least in part mediated by work-family enrichment. Taken together, these results provide strong evidence that family-friendly practises at work have a positive effect on employee engagement in their jobs, maybe through channels like enhanced job satisfaction, work-family enrichment, and access to workplace resources. Among healthcare employees, Bakker and Demerouti (2007) discovered that work involvement was inversely related to work-family conflict. Similarly, Michel and coworkers (2011) discovered that workers' levels of engagement in their jobs were inversely associated to both work-

family and family-work conflicts. There is a negative correlation between job satisfaction and family conflicts, according to other research. Pignata et al. (2016), for instance, discovered that job expectations and resources somewhat mediated the negative link between work engagement and work-to-family and family-to-work conflict in a study of school teachers. Similarly, Janssen et al. (2018) showed that work engagement was inversely associated to work-family conflict and that this relationship was mediated by job resources among banking industry workers.

References

1. Allen, T. D., & Martin, A. (2017). The work-family interface: A retrospective look at 20 years of research in JOHP. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 259.
2. Bakker, A. B., & Albrecht, S. (2018). Work engagement: current trends. *Career Development International*.
3. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.
4. Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 67(2), 169-198.
5. Crain, T. L., Hammer, L. B., Bodner, T., Kossek, E. E., Moen, P., Lilienthal, R., & Buxton, O. M. (2014). Work-family conflict, family-supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB), and sleep outcomes. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 19(2), 155.
6. Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work-family balance: A review and extension of the literature.
7. Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76-88.
8. Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76-88.
9. Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). 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.
10. 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.
11. Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Yragui, N. L., Bodner, T. E., & Hanson, G. C. (2013). Development and validation of a multidimensional measure of family supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB). *Journal of Management*, 39(3), 792-813.
 12. Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Yragui, N. L., Bodner, T., & Hanson, G. C. (2013). Development and validation of a multidimensional measure of family supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB). *Journal of Management*, 39(3), 792-813.
 13. Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Yragui, N. L., Bodner, T., & Hanson, G. C. (2013). Development and validation of a multidimensional measure of family supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB). *Journal of Management*, 39(3), 792-813.
 14. Husremović, D., Lučić, T., & Otuzbir, D. Povezanost porodičnih i radnih faktora sa konfliktom privatne i poslovne uloge.
 15. Janssen, O., Grutters, J., van der Lippe, T., & de Lange, A. H. (2018). How work engagement and job resources relate to work-to-family conflict and facilitation: Additive, synergistic, or buffering effects? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 27(2), 194-206.
 16. Kinnunen, U., Mauno, S., Nätti, J., Happonen, M., Perhoniemi, R., Tolvanen, A., ... & Tsupari, H. (2014). Cross-lagged associations between perceived external employability, job insecurity, and exhaustion: Testing gain and loss spirals according to the conservation of resources theory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(2), 238-256.
 17. Kossek, E. E., Lautsch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2011). Flexibility enactment theory: Implications of flexibility type, control, and boundary management for work-family effectiveness. *Handbook of Work-Family Integration*, 2, 109-133
 18. Matthews, R. A., & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. (2010). Development and initial validation of a work-family specific supportive supervisor behavior (W-FSSB) measure. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(2), 127-142.
 19. Matthews, R. A., & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. (2010). Development and initial validation of a work-family specific supportive supervisor behavior (W-FSSB) measure. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(2), 127-142.
 20. Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B. B. (2011). Antecedents of work-family conflict: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 689-725.
 21. Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of applied psychology*, 81(4), 400.
 22. Park, Y. J., Fritz, C., & Jex, S. M. (2014). Relationships between work-home segmentation and psychological detachment from work: The role of communication technology use at home. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19(2), 123-134.
 23. Pignata, S., Winefield, A. H., & Boyd, C. M. (2016). A longitudinal study of the relationship between work engagement and work-related musculoskeletal disorders: The role of physical and psychological job demands. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21(4), 469-480
 24. Rumondor, P. C. B., Pratomo, R. K., & Paramita, G. V. (2021). The Role of Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviour, Dyadic Coping, and Work-family Conflict in Predicting Marital Satisfaction of Financial Services Employee in Jakarta Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Social Sciences, Laws, Arts and Humanities-BINUS-JIC.
 25. Schaufeli W.B., Bakker A.B. (2004). Job demands, job resources and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 293-315.
 26. Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2002). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 62(4), 659-680.
 27. Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). Utrecht work engagement scale-17. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*.
 28. Xanthopoulou, D., Baker, A. B., Heuven, E., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). Working in the sky: a diary study on work engagement among flight attendants. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 13(4), 345.
 29. Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational behavior*, 74(3), 235-244.