

Family-supportive supervisor behaviours: the role of relational resources in work and home domains

Article

Accepted Version

Ererdi, C., Rofcanin, Y., Las Heras, M., Barraza, M., Wang, S., Bakker, A., Bosch, M. J. and Berber, A. (2023) Family-supportive supervisor behaviours: the role of relational resources in work and home domains. *European Management Review*. ISSN 1740-4762 doi:
<https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12576> Available at
<https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/112087/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/emre.12576>

Publisher: Wiley

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

**Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviours:
The Role of Relational Resources in Work and Home Domains**

Abstract

This study explores the nomological network of family supportive supervisor behaviours (FSSBs) at the weekly level. Drawing on the tenets of the W-HR model and the Conservation of Resources theory, we integrate relational resources in the model and investigate their role as triggers of FSSBs. Furthermore, we explore how FSSBs relate to both within domain (production deviance, employee creativity) and between domain (sleep quality and dyadic adjustment) employee outcomes, with a focus on exhaustion as a mediator. Our findings show that: 1) spousal support experienced by the supervisor is positively related to the employee's perception of FSSBs as enacted by the supervisor; 2) employees' perceptions of FSSBs are negatively related to employees' production deviance; and 3) exhaustion is a mediator between FSSBs and employee outcomes of creativity, sleep quality and dyadic adjustment. Our findings across two multi-source and diary studies underline the importance of designing and implementing FSSBs in a dynamic fashion.

Keywords: Family supportive supervisor behaviours, spousal support, workplace deviance, weekly diary data

Introduction

In a world where the lines between work and family are becoming more transparent and intertwined (e.g., dual-earner families and single parents; Van der Lippe, 2007), issues pertaining to work-family have become more important than ever. Thus, there is a need for family-supportive practices and behaviors that facilitate employees meeting their commitments across the work and non-work domains (Hammer, Kossek, Bodner, & Crain, 2013; Kelliher & Anderson, 2010). In the recent past, research has emphasized the emergence of a new type of leadership: family-supportive supervisor behaviours (i.e., FSSB). Much of the growing literature on FSSBs mainly focuses on the outcomes and consequences of engaging in such behaviours (Rofcanin, De Jong, Las Heras & Kim, 2018; Rofcanin, Las Heras & Escribano, 2020; Qing, Zhang & Wang, 2021). However, we know very little about the relational antecedents of such behaviours and the mechanisms that trigger supervisors to change the frequency and intensity of such behaviours in a dynamic fashion.

The over-arching goal of this study is to explore the nomological network of FSSBs, with a particular focus on employees, their spouses, and supervisors. We conceptualize FSSBs as dynamic resources that vary across weeks and thus adopt a within-person weekly diary design. We draw on the Work-Home Resources (W-HR) model (Ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012) to test our research model. This model delineates how resources in one domain (e.g., work) generate personal resources and have an indirect influence on outcomes in another domain (e.g., family; enrichment between domains). The W-HR model underscores the role of contextual resources (e.g., social support from significant others) that influence how enrichment unfolds between domains (Ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012).

Our first goal is to explore the antecedents of FSSBs. Supervisors are crucial in facilitating or hindering the balance of their employees' work and family domains (Hammer et al., 2013). However, we know little about the role of the support supervisors receive

themselves, which might facilitate the implementation of FSSBs. Triggered by the lack of research on the antecedents of FSSBs (for an exception, see Las Heras, Bosch, & Raes, 2015), we propose that supervisors' spousal support is an essential antecedent for the display of FSSBs. Our first contribution lies in exploring the critical role of spousal support, as a resource generator at home for the supervisor, in explaining the emergence of FSSBs. This contribution is crucial, as it expands the question "who/what facilitates FSSBs?" and therefore brings a new actor into the equation as a potential trigger of these behaviours (Crain & Stevens, 2018; Crain & Hammer, 2013; Hammer et al., 2013).

Our second goal is to explore the consequences of FSSBs with a particular focus on employee outcomes and mechanisms that have not been explored within the literature to date. We investigate two work domain outcomes: a) production deviance, and b) creativity; and two home domain outcomes: c) sleep quality and d) dyadic adjustment. We explore exhaustion as a mechanism to explain how and when the impact of FSSBs unfolds for recipients. Research shows that there are generally high organizational costs associated with deviant work behaviours (Bennett & Robinson, 2003), especially concerning production deviance; our research aims to investigate whether spousal support received by the supervisor results in lower levels of production deviance via FSSBs. In this research, our focus is on production deviance, which in literature is categorized as a sub-dimension of organizational deviance. While employees engage in behaviors such as leaving work early, taking excessive breaks, intentionally working slowly, or engaging in illegal behaviour in the workplace (Bennett & Robinson, 2003), it is often the underlying cause of these behaviours that categorizes which type of organizational deviance the employee engages in. Thus, in conjunction with the aims of this research, we define production deviance as any organizational deviance behaviour such as a purposeful deviation from or neglect of the standard in fulfilling one's responsibilities, targeted towards the organization, with the

underlying aim of maintaining resource levels and reduce further resource depletion in response to workplace stress (Ferguson, Carlson, Hunter & Whitten, 2012). Given the importance of reducing harmful employee behaviours for organizations, we argue that FSSBs may act as mechanisms for reducing these behaviours in the workplace. This goal leads to an important contribution of this paper in that we aim to reveal the possibility of FSSBs preventing employee production deviance and contributing positively to their work and family outcomes. Our study contributes to the ongoing debates regarding support from the organization to the employee (Leiva, Poilpot-Rocaboy & St-Onge, 2017; Al Kerdawy, 2018; Cirella, 2021; Clercq & Pereira, 2023), work-family interface (De Clercq & Pereira, 2022; Magrizos, Roumpi, Georgiadou, Kostopoulos & Vrontis, 2022) and workplace deviance (Mostafa, Boon, Abouarghoub & Cai, 2022). We test our conceptual models (depicted in Figures 1 and 3) with two weekly-diary studies.

Insert Figures 1 and 3 here

Theoretical Framework

The Conceptualisation of FSSBs. FSSBs are defined as the “enacted behaviors exhibited by supervisors that are supportive of families” (Hammer et al., 2009, p. 838). FSSBs include four dimensions: emotional support, instrumental support, role model behaviours, and implementation of creative work-family management policies for subordinates (Hammer et al., 2009). FSSB is different from general supervisor support and organizational support. For example, general supervisor support and perceived organizational support focuses on the emotional and instrumental support enacted by supervisors or organizations which is intended to improve employees’ well-being (Kossek et al., 2011), whereas FSSBs refer to content-specific support (e.g., work-family support) provided by the supervisors which focuses on supporting employees in managing work and nonwork conflict and increase work-family

enrichment (Crain et al., 2018). Some examples regarding FSSBs in daily organizational life include helping employees manage practical work-life issues such as adjusting work assignments to support employees' family or personal needs, helping them feel comfortable in expressing their voice about family or non-work issues by celebrating family successes, and role modelling behaviours such as sharing ideas on how supervisors manage their own personal and family priorities.

The W-HR Model. We draw on the W-HR model (Ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012) to explore the associations among our study variables. This model integrates the concepts of enrichment and conflict between domains. A key principle of the model is that resources generated in one domain (e.g., work or home) are beneficial for the functioning in another domain through the creation of personal resources (e.g., positive affect, cognitive flexibility, and resilience; Ten Brummelhuis, Haar, & Roche, 2014). Personal resources are volatile aspects of the self that are generally linked to resiliency and refer to an individual's sense of their ability to control and impact their environment successfully (Hobfoll, Johnson, Ennis, & Jackson, 2003). The model also proposes that contextual resources may play a key role and may help explain how personal resources generated in one domain are transferred into another domain and subsequently facilitate the enrichment between domains.

The Associations Between Supervisor's Spousal Support and FSSBs

In building our assumptions on the relationship between supervisor's spousal support at home and the FSSBs they exhibit at work, we draw on the home-to-work enrichment tenet of the WH-R model, which suggests that enrichment occurs when contextual resources generated in the home domain lead to positive outcomes in the work domain (Ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). Contextual resources, also known as personal resources, relate to resources that exist outside of the individual (Hobfoll, 2002), which can be found in the social contexts of the employee (Ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). In the context of our

research, we conceptualize the support from a spouse as a home domain contextual resource. Furthermore, FSSBs in our research are conceptualized as work domain resources increased with the support resource received at home, which is in parallel with the between domain transfer of resources concept of the W-HR model. Literature has proven the connection between spousal support and improved work outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction; Burke & Greenglass, 1999, job performance; Repetti, 1989) and a decrease in unwanted outcomes (i.e., work-home conflict and psychological distress, Aycan & Eskin, 2005).

We argue that increased accumulation of personal resources in the home domain in the form of spousal support would lead to a home-to-work enrichment process, where the supervisor has more resources in their arsenal to invest within the work domain. Accordingly, the WH-R model argues that people with greater access to personal resources are better positioned to invest those resources (Bakker & Geurts, 2004). As both work-home and home-work enrichment have shown to operate bi-directionally, we argue that in weeks when supervisors receive more support from their spouse in the home domain, they will have more resources left to invest in the work domain in the form of FSSBs (Ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). Furthermore, indirectly supporting our arguments, building on the W-HR model, the findings in Aw, Ilies, Li, Bakker and Liu (2021) reveal that employee provision and receipt of organizational citizenship behaviours within the work domain spill over to the family domain in the form of family performance and marital withdrawal behaviours. Conclusively, taking the affect based route of enrichment for this process (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne & Grzywacz, 2006), where greater attentiveness in one domain is associated with enhanced engagement in another domain through positive affect, we argue that the supervisor who has extra resources to invest as a result of the positive interactions and support they receive from their spouses (as they are likely to feel confident, reassured, and positive at home (e.g., Tremmel & Sonnentag, 2018; Ballesteros et al., 2018), would be more

appreciative and understanding of the family-related needs of their employees during these times and more willing to show FSSBs.

Hypothesis 1: Spousal support experienced by a supervisor (rated by the supervisor) is positively related to the supervisor's FSSBs (rated by the employee), at a weekly level.

The Associations Between FSSBs and Production Deviance

We argue that FSSBs generate positive resources for the recipients (e.g., positive energy, attention, flexibility), which we expect to reduce their production deviance behaviour at the weekly level. As such, we expect that during weeks in which employees enjoy the benefits associated with FSSBs, they are less likely to engage in production deviance that may negatively affect their supervisors or their organizations. This argument corresponds to the central tenet of the W-HR model that maintained resources (i.e., FSSBs) generate personal resources, which helps explain how enrichment occurs between work and non-work domains (i.e., deviant work behaviours). Framing production deviance in light of the W-HR model, our central argument is that FSSBs are instrumental in creating additional resources for employees in the workplace. In conjunction, as production deviance occurs as a response to the depletion of resources on part of the employee, we argue that an increase in these resources would naturally decrease production deviance, as the employee experiences decreased amounts of stress due to additional resources as a result of receiving increased family support from the supervisor.

Hypothesis 2: FSSBs (rated by the employee) are negatively associated with employee production-related deviant work behaviours (rated by the supervisor), at a weekly level.

Integrating the arguments above, we argue that FSSBs are mechanisms which shed light on the impact of spousal support received at home on employees' reduced production-related deviant work behaviours, every week.

Hypothesis 3: FSSBs (rated by the employee) mediate the association between spousal support experienced by a supervisor (rated by supervisor) and production deviance shown by employee (rated by the supervisor), at the week level.

Study 1: Method

Procedure and Participants. We conducted a weekly diary study involving employees and their supervisors in a financial company located in Chile over a four-week period (January - February 2018). To encourage participation, the HR unit and managers were offered a final report of the research findings at the aggregate level (i.e., no individual respondent could be identified) as an incentive. We received the email addresses of 120 employees, specifically, 80 employees and 40 supervisors. We had access to their contact details (i.e., email addresses) to: 1) send them an invitation to participate in an electronic questionnaires via Qualtrics; 2) link the repeated measurements to the same individual; and 3) link the data of the corresponding employee and supervisor. In the invitation email, we explained the possibility of withdrawing from the study and promised strict confidentiality, such that only researchers could access the data and would anonymize it before carrying out analyses. We opted for a weekly diary design because prior research confirmed that job resources (e.g., support) and job performance fluctuate across workweeks (e.g., Bakker & Bal, 2010) and individuals can accurately reflect upon their support, well-being, and emotions throughout a workweek (Parkinson et al., 1995; Totterdell et al., 2006).

We translated the survey items from the original English version to Spanish using back-translation (Brislin, 1970). First, we assessed socio-demographic variables using a one-time, general survey. One week later, we invited the participants weekly for a period of four consecutive workweeks. The surveys for employees and supervisors were sent on the same day, namely each Thursday evening of the selected weeks. The participants were told to finish the questionnaire by Friday. We asked the supervisors to rate the level of spousal support they had experienced during the previous week (past five working days from the prior Friday) and the amount of production deviance they had perceived in their subordinates. The employees assessed the amount of family-supportive supervisor behaviours they received during the past week. Participants could fill out the survey during their working schedules.

From the total pool of 40 supervisors and 80 employees, 25 supervisors (response rate of 62.5%) and 68 employees (response rate of 85%) replied and were matched without the loss of any data and within confidentiality limits. The size of our sample context is in line with prior research, which adopted a within-person weekly study approach on similar variables (e.g., Schreurs et al., 2012; Rofcanin et al., 2018). Of the 25 supervisors, 60% were men and on average 42.57 years old ($SD = 6.93$). Of the 68 employees, 66% were men and on average 37.09 years old ($SD = 7.69$). All participants were highly educated (i.e., held at least a community college degree) and worked full-time. On average, employees had 9.39 years ($SD = 7.74$) tenure in the organization and supervisors had 9.90 years ($SD = 6.99$) of organizational tenure. All of the supervisors who participated in this study had a significant other (i.e., wife, husband or partner) and on average, they had been together for 4.3 years ($S.D. = 1.2$ years). 80% of the supervisors had at least one child, and on average, they had 2.1 children ($S.D. = 1.4$). Among the subordinates, 55% had a significant other (i.e., wife, husband or partner) and 68% of them had at least one child.

Measures

The research variables were assessed using validated scales. Given the weekly diary design, we: 1) adjusted the original framing to capture the weekly time frame (i.e., looking back upon the prior week; for a similar approach see Bakker & Bal, 2010), and 2) measured each research variable with a reduced number of items to lower the burden for the participants (cf. Ohly et al., 2010). All items used seven-point Likert scales (answer categories ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree).

Supervisors' spousal support (reported by supervisors). We selected the highest loading two items of Abramis and Caplan (1985) to assess the emotional and instrumental support a supervisor received from their spouse at home. The included items are: "Last week, my spouse tried to make my life easier" and "Last week, my spouse listened to my concerns." The average reliability coefficient is 0.93.

FSSBs (reported by employees). We selected the four highest-loading items of the short scale developed by Hammer et al.(2009). The items assess the emotional and instrumental support employees experienced from their supervisors, the two most examined forms of support concerning the work-family interface (French et al., 2018). The included items are as follows: "Last week, my supervisor made me feel comfortable to talk to him/her about my conflicts between work and non-work." and "Last week, my supervisor worked effectively with employees to creatively solve conflicts between work and non-work." The average reliability coefficient is 0.73.

Production Deviance (reported by supervisors). We used the highest loading of two items from the scale of Bennett and Robinson (2000) to assess the counterproductive behaviours directed toward the organization. Items were reframed to adjust to the other-rated perspective (i.e., supervisors rating the deviant behaviour displayed by their employees): "Last week, my

employee intentionally worked slower than he/she could have worked" and "Last week, my employee put little effort into his/her work". The average reliability coefficient is 0.93.

Controls.

In our subsequent analyses, we controlled for the perceived co-worker support (reported by employees)¹. We used the two highest-loading items from the co-worker support scale of Van Veldhoven and Meijman (1994) to measure instrumental and emotional support received from co-workers. Scale items include: "Last week, I felt I could ask my colleagues for help if there was a need" and "Last week, I felt valued by my colleagues". The average reliability coefficient is 0.77.

In the initial analyses we controlled for age, gender, occupation, tenure and number of children among both employees and supervisors. The direction and strength of the results did not change; therefore, we excluded these controls from further analyses to avoid complex modelling (Bakker et al., 2015).

Study 1: Data Analysis and Findings

We conducted multi-level path analyses using Mplus 8.3 (Muthén & Muthén, 2017) to account for the nested structure of the data, in which weeks are nested in persons and persons are nested in supervisors (Preacher et al., 2010). We have a three-level model, with weeks at the first level (Level 1 N=231), persons at the second level (Level 2 N=68), and supervisors at the third level (Level 3 N=25)². We used procedures outlined by the Monte Carlo method to test our mediation hypotheses (MacKinnon & Fairchild, 2009). Furthermore, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis with four latent factors (i.e., supervisor's spousal support, perceived co-worker support, family-supportive supervisor behaviour, employee production deviance), which had a reasonable to good fit with our data (CFI = 0.92, TLI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.08, SRMR_{within} = 0.09, SRMR_{between} (level 2) = 0.05, SRMR_{between} (level 3) = 0.06).

¹ Further information on the reasoning of control variables can be solicited from the first author.

² Detailed information on the procedures and the codes of the analyses can be obtained from the first author.

Furthermore, each item loaded significantly and in the expected direction onto its corresponding latent factor. Table 1 reports the means, standard deviations, and correlations for all variables in study 1.

Insert Table 1 here

Insert Figure 2 here

We display the results in Figure 2. In support of Hypothesis 1, we found that the spousal support experienced by the supervisor was positively related to the employee's perception of FSSBs enacted by the supervisor ($\beta = 0.27$, S.E. = 0.14, $p = 0.035$). Moreover, we found that the employee's perception of FSSBs was negatively related to employees' production deviance (rated by the supervisor) ($\beta = -0.40$, SE = 0.11, $p < 0.001$). Hence, this result supports Hypothesis 2. The multi-level path analysis results can be found in Table 2 of the manuscript.

Insert Table 2 here

Hypothesis 3, we proposed that the association between spousal support experienced by a supervisor (rated by the supervisor) and employee production deviance (rated by the supervisor) is mediated by FSSBs (rated by the employee). The result showed that the confidence interval does not include a value of zero (95% CI= [-0.40/-0.01]), thus, this hypothesis was supported³.

Study 2

Associations Between FSSBs and Employee Outcomes via Exhaustion

³ In support of our proposed model, we conducted some additional analyses, which can be provided upon request.

The first study demonstrates that spousal support is an important relational resource that explains the display of FSSBs and that these behaviours, in turn, reduce production deviance. Taking this finding a step further, we aim to unpack the mechanism that justifies how and why FSSBs impact work and non-work outcomes. In line with the W-HR model, positive affect and cognitive flexibility are likely the personal resources (e.g., mechanisms) which explain the impact of FSSBs on exhaustion at the week-level. The conceptual model for Study 2 can be found in Figure 3 of the manuscript.

Insert Figure 3 here

During weeks in which employees benefit more from FSSBs, they are more likely to feel positive and energized because the display of such behaviours indicates that supervisors care for the well-being of their subordinates (Marescaux et al., 2020). Furthermore, FSSBs in the form of instrumental support help and creative work-family solutions provided by supervisors enable employees to tackle the various issues in their work-family related activities (Rofcanin et al., 2017). Similarly, benefiting from the advantages of FSSBs during these weeks, employees are less likely to ruminate and feel stressed about work issues, enabling them to feel resourceful and equipped (Russo et al., 2018).

In building the relationship between FSSBs and exhaustion, we base our assumptions on the conservation of resources aspect of the WH-R model. According to the W-HR model, and the COR theory, resources can generate new resources (Ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). In conceptualizing FSSBs as a type of support, we argue that they can be used as a key resource within the organization, as key resources in COR theory refer to management resources that facilitate the selection, alteration and implementation of other resources (Thoits, 1994). While conceptualizing FSSBs as a key resource on the management side of things, we conceptualize the decrease in exhaustion as an increase in a personal resource,

mainly physical energy. Thus, basing our argumentation on the gain spiral concept of WH-R, we suggest that employees who receive FSSBs in the shape of key resources use these resources to mitigate the demands of the job, which in turn results in decreased exhaustion, as people with more resources are less affected when they face resource drains because they possess substitute resources (Hobfoll, 2002).

Hypothesis 4: FSSBs are negatively associated with exhaustion, on a weekly level.

The W-HR model is grounded in the argument that stress depletes employee resources, leaving employees unable to cope with work demands and unable to concentrate on their work tasks effectively (Hobfoll et al., 2018). Weeks in which employees feel less exhausted (because they receive more FSSBs), they are more likely to feel creative regarding their work tasks. This is because exhaustion as a depleting personal resource is low and employees are more likely to spend time, energy and focused attention to be creative at work. Creativity necessitates employees to be confident and persistent in working on a task when confronted with setbacks (Shalley et al., 2004). Employees who feel less exhausted as a result of benefiting from FSSBs are more likely to have cognitive resources freed up from worrying about their work schedules or nonwork-related issues and report better sleep quality (Wang et al., 2018).

Underlying elements of sleep quality include depth, endurance and sustainability of the sleep experienced (Yu et al., 2012). When work and family demands are high, and given that time is a limited resource, the quality of sleep is likely to be compromised (Sianoja et al., 2020). Thus, FSSBs, which help employees seek better work-life balance, may facilitate the quality of sleep because the display of such behaviours reduces stress and provides resources. Previous (though few) between-person studies demonstrate that FSSBs are positively

associated with sleep quality (Crain et al., 2014; Crain et al., 2019) and a recent review study underlines that FSSBs are key resources to help enhance sleep quality (Crain & Stevens, 2018). Building on these studies, we argue that exhaustion is negatively associated with sleep quality, on a weekly basis.

Finally, we argue that during weeks wherein employees feel less exhausted due to the benefits of FSSBs, they are likely to report higher dyadic adjustment. The latter underlines the adaptive and positive exchange of behaviours and experiences between partners. Examples include stimulating the exchange of ideas, laughing together, calmly discussing aspects relating to life and working on a project together (Spanier, 1976). During weeks employees benefit from FSSBs and feel less exhausted, they are likely to spend quality time with their partners. These employees are likely to engage more with matters relating to their family domains and, in particular, pay attention to the quality of relationships with their significant others (e.g., Rofcanin et al., 2019). Thus we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 5: Exhaustion is negatively associated with employee outcomes of (a) creativity, (b) sleep quality and (c) dyadic adjustment, at a weekly level.

The W-HR model suggests that initial resource gains lead to the generation of further resources. Applied to our current model, during weeks when employees perceive higher FSSB displays, they are less likely to feel exhausted. This is because the personal resources of positive affect and cognitive flexibility act as linchpins to account for the positive impact of FSSBs on employee exhaustion. In turn, during these weeks when employees report a lower extent of exhaustion, they are likely to feel more creative because they are not cognitively tied up with hindering work demands or pressing family matters. They freed up the necessary cognitive and mental resources to be more creative at their work in these weeks. Furthermore,

feeling less exhausted during these weeks, employees are likely to experience better sleep quality. Finally, reporting less exhaustion in these weeks, employees are likely to spend more quality time with their partners who are significant parties of the employees' family domain.

Our last hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 6: Exhaustion mediates the positive associations between FSSBs and employee outcomes of creativity, sleep quality and dyadic adjustment, at a weekly level.

Study 2: Method

Procedure and Participants. Through the involvement of a leading European business school and the help of a non-profit family network business, we conducted a weekly diary study of employees working in the Catalonia region of Spain (mainly, Barcelona) for a period of four weeks (February – March 2019). Our invitation e-mail explained the study procedure and emphasized the confidentiality of responses. To encourage participation, we provided a full report of our findings at the aggregate level to HR units. In coordination with the HR units of the selected three companies and the results of a power analysis, we ensured the inclusion of dyads of employees and their supervisors.

On each Friday, participants received a survey via a system called Cvent for a period of five consecutive weeks. Similar to the procedures in Study 1, surveys were conducted in Spanish and back-translation procedures were used to ensure consistency in meaning (Brislin, 1989). First, we assessed the socio-demographic variables using a one-time general survey. One week later, we invited participants weekly for a period of four consecutive workweeks.

Our final sample was composed of 237 employees. Among the respondents, 65% were women with an average age of 36.7 years old ($SD = 8.22$). Similar to study 1, all participants were highly educated and had full-time jobs. All of the participants had a significant other

(i.e., wife, husband, or partner) and on average, they have been together for 6.2 years (s.d. = 2.5 years). On average, they had worked for 3.6 years in their organization (SD = 6.78).

Measures

In line with the weekly diary design nature of our study, we (1) adjusted the time frame of the original scale items to refer to the weekly design and (2) utilised a reduced number of items for each scale to eliminate the burden on our study participants (Ohly et al., 2010). All items used seven-point Likert scales and were evaluated by employees (answer categories ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree).

FSSBs. We used four items from the scale developed by Hammer et al. (2009). The highest-loading items were selected to capture the weekly variations. An example item includes: “This week, my supervisor was willing to listen to my problems in juggling work and non-work life” (averaged $a = 0.95$).

Exhaustion. A four-item scale developed by Demerouti et al. (2010) was utilised to measure employees’ emotional exhaustion. Example items include: “This week, there were days when I felt tired before I arrived at work;” and “This week, I often felt emotionally drained during my work” (averaged $a = 0.82$).

Creativity (evaluated by supervisors of subordinates). We utilised the highest-loading of three items of the scale developed by Oldham and Cummings (1996) to measure employee creativity. An example item includes: “How original and practical was this subordinate’s work this week?” (averaged $a = 0.82$)

Sleep quality. The three-item scale developed by Yin et al. (2006) was used to measure the quality and effectiveness of sleep. An example item included: “This week, I felt refreshed after my sleep” (averaged $a = 0.94$).

Dyadic adjustment. We used the four-item of scale by Spanier (1976) to evaluate dyadic adjustment with one's significant other at a weekly level. One example included: "This week, we had a stimulating exchange of ideas" (averaged $a = 0.88$).

Controls. We controlled for perceived co-worker support (three items of the scale developed by Van Veldhoven & Meijman, 1994; one example included: "I felt valued by my colleagues"; averaged $a = 0.83$). Furthermore, we controlled for employees' family motivation, as employees who are highly family-motivated may report a higher degree of FSSBs from their supervisors. We utilised the five-item scale developed by Menges et al. (2016) to measure it as a trait variable in the first week before the weekly data collection began. One example included: "I do this job because I care about supporting my family" ($a = 0.88$). The direction and results of our analyses with control variables in the equation did not change, hence they were excluded from further analyses (Becker et al., 2015).

Study 2: Results and Discussion

Table 3 reports the means, standard deviations, and correlations for all variables in study 2.

Insert Table 3 here

Before proceeding with the analyses, we carried out a multilevel confirmatory factor analysis with five latent factors (i.e., FSSBs, emotional exhaustion, sleep quality, creativity and dyadic adjustment). Overall, the hypothesized five-factor model had a reasonable to good fit with our data, which is better compared to four-factor models (CFI = 0.94, TLI = 0.92, RMSEA = 0.06, SRMR_{within} = 0.10, SRMR_{between} = 0.08).

Findings from our analyses revealed that FSSBs are negatively associated with exhaustion ($\gamma = -0.14, p < 0.001$). In turn, and with FSSBs in the equation, exhaustion is negatively associated with creativity ($\gamma = -0.14, p < 0.001$), sleep quality ($\gamma = -0.45, p < 0.001$), and

dyadic adjustment ($\gamma = -0.09, p < 0.01$). Confidence intervals for these associations do not include the value of zero (95% CI = [0.009/0.037] for creativity, 95% CI = [0.040/0.096] for sleep quality, 95% CI = [0.003/0.026] for dyadic adjustment), which supports hypothesis 5. The nature of the indirect association is partial, as FSSBs are still associated with employee outcomes positively when the mediator is in the equation (please see Table 4 and Figure 4 for details of the results).

Insert Table 4 here

Insert Figure 4 here

Overall Discussion

Our contributions, which we discuss below, relate to research on FSSBs and the W-HR model.

Theoretical contributions

Within-person changes in FSSBs. Across two diary studies, our findings demonstrate that FSSBs exhibited weekly variation, 25% in Study 1 and 32% in Study 2. This finding underlines that these family-supportive behaviours do not have to be concrete and singular events. On the contrary, their demonstration shows variation across weeks, which is important for theoretical and practical reasons. Theoretically, previous research concerning FSSBs has assumed that this construct is static and does not change over relatively short periods (Hill, Morganson, Matthews, & Atkinson, 2016; Odle-Dusseau, Britt, & Greene-Shortridge, 2012; Qing & Zhou, 2017; Zhang, Jin & Jiang, 2020). However, as discussed in a recent review on FSSBs (Crain & Stevens, 2018), these behaviours fluctuate at the within-person level, meaning that there are times when a supervisor is more likely to exhibit family supportiveness and times when a supervisor is less likely to exhibit such supportiveness. To capture this

dynamism, we adopted a weekly diary design. In adopting such a design, in addition to our contribution to FSSB, our research adds to the most recent debates on the importance of "dynamism in the work-family research area". From a practical point of view, weekly variation in FSSBs supports the notion that weekly-level HR interventions can be developed and implemented as low-cost and informal ways to help employees reduce their exhaustion and enhance their outcomes in work and non-work domains.

Antecedents of FSSBs. Our results go beyond the limited number of studies in previous research which mainly explore the antecedents of FSSB from three perspectives including family-related benefits and culture (e.g., Mills et al., 2014; Rofcanin et al., 2020), supervisor behaviours (e.g., Pan, 2018) and characteristic of the supervisor-employee relationships (e.g., Huffman & Olson, 2017; Rofcanin et al., 2021). Moreover, our results add to a body of research that explores the impact of supervisors' family lives on employees' work lives: The findings in Ten Brummelhuis et al. (2014) reveal that work-family enrichment of supervisors' trickle down to employees' work engagement, emphasizing the importance of the support one receives at home. Furthermore, Rofcanin et al., (2020) have demonstrated that the presence of a supportive and resourceful work environment (POS) enables FSSBs, while time pressure and negative consequences of using work-family initiatives prevent the display of FSSBs. Understanding the antecedents to FSSBs is vital, as these behaviours are informal and constitute relatively less costly ways of implementing HR practices (Hammer et al., 2009; Rofcanin, Las Heras & Bakker, 2017; Marescaux et al., 2020).

Consequences of FSSBs. Employee outcomes stemming from FSSBs continue to be a key topic within the literature. Research to date has put emphasis on both the work (Rofcanin et al, 2018; Marescaux et al., 2020; Han & McLean, 2020) and non-work (e.g., Yu, Pitchler, Russo & Hammer, 2022; Rofcanin et al., 2020) outcomes of FSSBs.

Regarding production deviance, our findings go beyond prior research on the stimulating role of FSSB on beneficial workplace outcomes (e.g., performance; Rofcanin et al., 2018; intrinsic motivation; Marescaux et al., 2020; career satisfaction; Wei, Chen, Zhang & Zhang, 2020) and add to the limited emerging literature on the impact of FSSB in alleviating detrimental work outcomes (e.g., decreasing turnover intentions; Bagger & Li, 2014; Zhang, Jin & Jiang, 2020). Deviant behaviours are often examined according to the target of the behaviour, thus, they could be targeted at the organisation (i.e., organizational deviance) or targeted at individuals (i.e., interpersonal deviance). In this research, we opted to use a specific sub-factor of deviant behaviours in the shape of production deviance. The decision to focus on production deviance in this research has been nested in the assumptions that employees often engage in production deviance to deal with the demands of the organisation, often in the shape of stress, and in order to conserve the resources available to them to deal with stress within the work domain. There are high economic costs (e.g., arising from being late to work, not taking responsibility and tasks) associated with employees' production deviance (Bennett & Robinson, 2003; Robinson, Persich, Stawicki & Krishakumar, 2019). Consequently, identifying buffering mechanisms of production deviance is important to give insight into how to mitigate these negative work behaviours. Our study supports that supervisors' spousal support increases the employees' perceptions of FSSB and, in turn, lowers their production deviance.

Furthermore, our findings demonstrate that employees who benefit from FSSBs show a lower extent of exhaustion and engage in desired behaviours at work (creativity) and non-work domains (sleep quality and dyadic adjustment). Regarding creativity, research has argued that FSSBs help employees juggle home demands effectively and enable them to free their minds of the stress associated with work and home lives. This body of research has mainly explored work performance (Ode-Dusseau et al., 2016), job satisfaction (Crain &

Stevens, 2018), affective commitment (Mills, Matthews & Henning, 2014) and sources of motivation (Rofcanin et al., 2018) as indicators of the effectiveness of FSSBs in the work domain (Crain & Stevens, 2018). We contribute to this nascent body of research by exploring creativity as a valued employee outcome which brings a competitive advantage and distinctiveness to organizations that employ a creative workforce. In terms of our focus on sleep quality, we contribute to the latest debates on the consequences of FSSBs: In their study on sleep leadership, Sianoja et al. (2020) show that FSSBs relate to subjective and objective sleep quality, at the between-person level. Prior between-person level studies also show that FSSBs reduce stress and lead to enhanced sleep quality (Sianoja et al., 2020; Crain et al., 2014; Berkman et al., 2010).

Our focus on dyadic adjustment is also a novel addition to FSSB research. Theory and empirical research on FSSBs have mainly focused on work-to-family or family-to-work-related outcomes with a focus on conflict and enrichment (Crain & Stevens, 2018; Crain et al., 2014; Yu et al., 2021). While these studies are crucial to demonstrating that FSSBs impact the family domain, they have not yet captured relational dynamics that occur between partners. This is an important omission, as ongoing relationships with one's partner and sharing important sources of resource generation and accumulation affect the individual. To capture the role of one's partner and to show that the beneficial outcomes of FSSBs exceed the focal employee, we integrated the role of dyadic adjustment. Our findings support the assumption that the benefits of FSSBs are shared and experienced within a dyadic relationship. We suggest that future research explore and expand on this finding by adopting a crossover – spillover angle and that it empirically validates the consequences of FSSBs for the partner of the recipient (e.g., Rofcanin et al., 2018; Bakker et al., 2019; Gorgievski et al., 2019). Our research thus adds to these works on the work-home resources model, especially

the conceptualization of exhaustion as a mechanism for understanding the consequences of FSSBs.

Contributions to Work-Home Resources Model. As a final contribution, our method in these studies also extends the research on the W-HR model. Only recently, studies have begun to integrate FSSBs as dynamic resources (Rofcanin et al., 2016; Nohe et al., 2014) rather than static ones. Recent studies using this model tended to employ a daily diary design in collecting data (e.g., Nohe et al., 2014; Du et al., 2018; Du et al., 2020), while our two studies employ a weekly diary design, which allows us to demonstrate and capture the effect of FSSBs on a wider timescale⁴.

Limitations and Future Research Avenue

The contributions and strengths of our research design and findings (e.g., two diary studies in under-studied contexts, additional rated variables, weekly diary design) should be seen in light of the study's limitations. First, data from Study 1 were collected in one organization in Chile. Although this data collection method has the advantage to hold some possibly interfering variables constant among our respondents, it also warrants caution when generalizing our findings to other organizations and cultures. However, relying on one organization did not impede answering the within-person formulated research questions, primarily since the data analyses relied on an individual's baseline to make comparisons. Nevertheless, it might be interesting to examine the research model among distinct cultural settings, as the value of different sources of support may differ across individualistic and collectivistic cultures.

Second, we used shortened items due to space and time limitations. We did this to minimize the interference for the supervisors and employees of the company and to limit the costly organizational time of filling out our questionnaire. However, prior research has found

⁴ Further information on the choice and justification of the weekly diary design can be obtained from the first author.

that even single-item measures are appropriate for measuring constructs that are relatively narrow or unambiguous to respondents (Wanous et al., 1997). So, although all scale items contributed to a good internal validity of the scale, to minimize measurement error, we acknowledge that using more items to measure one construct is better (Eisinga et al., 2013). In addition, for FSSB, we only measured two dimensions of FSSB: emotional support and instrumental support. The reason that we focused on these two dimensions aligns with the reasons from French et al. (2018). We believe that emotional support and instrumental support are the two most studied and well-established types of social support in the work-family literature. However, we admitted this is a limitation and suggest future research on FSSB to consider all four dimensions of FSSB.

Third, we were not able to infer directionality or causality between our research variables. We examined the relations of the different variables at one point in time. However, we used supervisor- and employee-rated measures to eliminate possible biases of common-method sources. Nevertheless, regarding Study 1, it may be possible that observing production deviance behaviour from their subordinate might make a leader less prone to enact FSSBs, and less enactment of FSSBs might reflect an ego-depleted supervisor who is not perceiving spousal support at home either. To get an indication of the possibility of reversed directionality of the relationship (for a similar approach, see, for example, Meier & Spector, 2013), we examined an alternative model with a reversed order. However, we found that these relationships were not significant. Nevertheless, future research might use experimental designs to infer directionality and (temporal) causality. Regarding Study 2, it may be that employees who are exhausted are likely to receive more FSSBs and, as a result, report better outcomes. The results of this alternative model were not significant.

Moreover, the sample size for study 1 is small, which can be considered a limitation. In study 1, we collected supervisor-subordinate data from 25 supervisors and 68 employees

(response rate of 85%). Although the size of our sample context is in line with prior research which adopted a within-person weekly study approach on similar variables (e.g., Schreurs et al., 2012; Rofcanin et al., 2018), the small sample size limits our findings. In future studies, we suggest a larger sample size may be more representative to capture the antecedents and consequences of FSSBs.

Our study focuses on the resource transfer between domains, such as resources created within the home domain transferring to the work domain. However, we believe there is a lot to explore in terms of additional mechanisms which could further explain and explore the associations in our study. For example, the direct negative relationship found between FSSBs by the supervisor and production deviance exhibited by the employee could be seen as a form of trickle-down. It could be valuable to integrate the trickle-down literature (Wo et al., 2015), with the spillover-crossover literature (Bakker & Demerouti, 2013).

In response to recent calls from the literature in using lagged analysis when analysing supervisor behaviours (Qing, Zhang, Wang, 2021), we suggest future research strengthen causality claims in FSSB literature by using at least one-month time-lags in between variables collected. In work-family literature, 1 – a month lag or 6-month lag was considered appropriate to examine the “loss spiral” of resources in the work and home domains (Demerouti et al., 2007; Russo et al., 2018; Matthews et al., 2014), thus, we suggest future research adopt 1- a month or 6- month time-lags to examine the causality of “gain spiral” processes of FSSBs.

Practical implications

Given the high prevalence of demonstrating FSSBs, supervisors should be aware that they can act as facilitators for employees' work-life interaction by providing emotional as well as instrumental support, thereby also improving work (e.g., motivation; Bosch et al.,-2018, engagement: Matthews et al., 2014), as well as non-work outcomes of the employee (e.g.,

sleep: Sianoja et al., 2020; Breugh, & Frye, 2008; Matthews et al., 2014). Organizations can benefit from providing supervisors with FSSB training (e.g., how to deal with or react to employees' questions for flexibility in work arrangements due to changing home demands; Hammer et al., 2011; Hopkins, 2005). Organizations could also benefit from instigating FSSBs among their supervisors by formally evaluating their performance and effectiveness on this criterion (i.e., making 'family-supportiveness' one of their objectives; Lirio et al.,-2008). One way of doing this would be to attach compensation to these formal evaluations of FSSBs, where supervisors who engage in standard or over-expected standard levels of these behaviours could see themselves rewarded with monetary or benefits-based compensations.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

References

- Abbey, A., Abramis, D. J., & Caplan, R. D. (1985). Effects of different sources of social support and social conflict on emotional well-being. *Basic and applied social psychology*, 6(2), 111-129.
- Al Kerdawy, M. M. A. (2019). The role of corporate support for employee volunteering in strengthening the impact of green human resource management practices on corporate social responsibility in the Egyptian firms. *European Management Review*, 16(4), 1079-1095.
- Aw, S. S., Ilies, R., Li, X., Bakker, A. B., & Liu, X. Y. (2021). Work-related helping and family functioning: A work-home resources perspective. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 94(1), 55-79.
- Aycan, Z., & Eskin, M. (2005). Relative contributions of childcare, spousal support, and organizational support in reducing work-family conflict for men and women: The case of Turkey. *Sex roles*, 53, 453-471.
- Bagger, J., & Li, A. (2014). How does supervisory family support influence employees' attitudes and behaviors? A social exchange perspective. *Journal of management*, 40(4), 1123-1150.
- Bakker, A. B., & Bal, M. P. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83, 189-206.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2013). The Spillover-Crossover model. In J. Grzywacs & E. Demerouti (Eds.), *New Frontiers in Work and Family Research* (pp. 54-70). Hove Sussex, UK: Psychology Press.
- Bakker, A. B., & Geurts, S. A. (2004). Toward a dual-process model of work-home interference. *Work and occupations*, 31(3), 345-366.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Euwema, M. C. (2005). Job resources buffer the impact of job demands on burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10, 170-180.
- Ballesteros Leiva, F., Poilpot-Rocaboy, G., & St-Onge, S. (2018). Social support and life-domain interactions among assigned and self-initiated expatriates. *European Management Review*, 15(3), 293-313.
- Becker, T. E., Atinc, G., Breugh, J. A., Carlson, K. D., Edwards, J. R., & Spector, P. E. (2016). Statistical control in correlational studies: 10 essential recommendations for organizational researchers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(2), 157-167.

- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2003). The past, present, and future of workplace deviance research.
- Berkman, L. F., Buxton, O., Ertel, K., & Okechukwu, C. (2010). Managers' practices related to work–family balance predict employee cardiovascular risk and sleep duration in extended care settings. *Journal of occupational health psychology, 15*(3), 316.
- Bosch, M. J., Las Heras, M., Russo, M., Rofcanin, Y., & i Grau, M. G. (2018). How context matters: The relationship between family supportive supervisor behaviours and motivation to work moderated by gender inequality. *Journal of Business Research, 82*, 46-55.
- Breaugh, J. A., & Frye, N. K. (2008). Work–family conflict: The importance of family-friendly employment practices and family-supportive supervisors. *Journal of business and psychology, 22*, 345-353.
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology, 1*(3), 185-216.
- Brossoit, R. M., Crain, T. L., Leslie, J. J., Hammer, L. B., Truxillo, D. M., & Bodner, T. E. (2019). The effects of sleep on workplace cognitive failure and safety. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 24*(4), 411.
- Burke, R. J., & Greenglass, E. R. (1999). Work–family conflict, spouse support, and nursing staff well-being during organizational restructuring. *Journal of occupational health psychology, 4*(4), 327.
- 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.
- Cirella, S. (2021). Managing collective creativity: Organizational variables to support creative teamwork. *European Management Review, 18*(4), 404-417.
- 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.
- 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.
- De Clercq, D., & Pereira, R. (2022). Overwhelmed by family, but supported by likeminded, trustworthy coworkers: effects on role ambiguity and championing behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance, (ahead-of-print)*.

- De Clercq, D., & Pereira, R. (2023). Violated contracts, inadequate career support, but still forgiveness: Key organizational factors that determine championing behaviors. *European Management Review*.
- Demerouti, E., Mostert, K., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Burnout and work engagement: a thorough investigation of the independency of both constructs. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 15(3), 209.
- Demerouti, E., Taris, T. W., & Bakker, A. B. (2007). Need for recovery, home–work interference and performance: Is lack of concentration the link?. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 71(2), 204-220.
- Du, D., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2020). Capitalization on positive family events and task performance: A perspective from the work–home resources model. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 25(5), 357.
- Du, D., Derks, D., & Bakker, A. B. (2018). Daily spillover from family to work: A test of the work–home resources model. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(2), 237.
- Eisinga, R., Grotenhuis, M. T., & Pelzer, B. (2013). The reliability of a two-item scale: Pearson, Cronbach, or Spearman-Brown?. *International journal of public health*, 58, 637-642.
- Ferguson, M., Carlson, D., Hunter, E. M., & Whitten, D. (2012). A two-study examination of work–family conflict, production deviance and gender. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(2), 245-258.
- French, K. A., Dumani, S., Allen, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2018). A meta-analysis of work–family conflict and social support. *Psychological bulletin*, 144(3), 284.
- Gorgievski, M. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2010). Work engagement and workaholism: comparing the self-employed and salaried employees. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 5(1), 83–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760903509606>
- Hammer, L. B., Ernst Kossek, E., Bodner, T., & Crain, T. (2013). Measurement development and validation of the family supportive supervisor behavior short-form (FSSB-SF). *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 18(3), 285.
- Hammer, L. B., Ernst Kossek, E., Bodner, T., & Crain, T. (2013). Measurement development and validation of the family supportive supervisor behavior short-form (FSSB-SF). *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 18(3), 285.
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Yragui, N. L., Bodner, T. E., & Hanson, G. C. (2009). Development and validation of a multidimensional measure of family supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB). *Journal of management*, 35(4), 837-856.

- Han, S. J., & McLean, G. N. (2020). Effects of family-supportive supervisor behaviors and organizational climate on employees. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 44(6/7), 659-674.
- Hill, R. T., Morganson, V. J., Matthews, R. A., & Atkinson, T. P. (2016). LMX, breach perceptions, work-family conflict, and well-being: A mediational model. *The Journal of psychology*, 150(1), 132-149.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2002). Social and psychological resources and adaptation. *Review of general psychology*, 6(4), 307-324.
- Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J. P., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of resources in the organizational context: The reality of resources and their consequences. *Annual review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior*, 5, 103-128.
- Hobfoll, S. E., Johnson, R. J., Ennis, N., & Jackson, A. P. (2003). Resource loss, resource gain, and emotional outcomes among inner city women. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 84(3), 632.
- Hopkins, N., & Reicher, S. (2005). Culture, social identity and the organisation of collective action: developing a culturally sensitive social psychology. *PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDIES-UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT*, 50(2/3), 217.
- Huffman, A. H., & Olson, K. J. (2017). Gender differences in perceptions of resources and turnover intentions of work-linked couples in masculine occupations. *Stress and Health*, 33(4), 309-321.
- Jana Cason, D. H. S., Kim Hartmann PhD, O. T. R., & Tammy Richmond, M. S. (2018). Telehealth in Occupational Therapy. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 72, 1-18.
- Kelliher, C., & Anderson, D. (2010). Doing more with less? Flexible working practices and the intensification of work. *Human relations*, 63(1), 83-106.
- Kossek, E. E., Baltes, B. B., & Matthews, R. A. (2011). How work-family research can finally have an impact in organizations. *Industrial and organizational psychology*, 4(3), 352-369.
- Las Heras, M., Bosch, M. J., & Raes, A. M. (2015). Sequential mediation among family friendly culture and outcomes. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(11), 2366-2373.
- Lirio, P., Lee, M. D., Williams, M. L., Haugen, L. K., & Kossek, E. E. (2008). The inclusion challenge with reduced-load professionals: The role of the manager. *Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration*,

- The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management, 47(3), 443-461.
- MacKinnon, D. P., & Fairchild, A. J. (2009). Current directions in mediation analysis. *Current directions in psychological science*, 18(1), 16-20.
- Magrizos, S., Roumpi, D., Georgiadou, A., Kostopoulos, I., & Vrontis, D. (2022). The dark side of meaningful work-from-home: A nonlinear approach. *European Management Review*.
- Marescaux, E., Rofcanin, Y., Las Heras, M., Ilies, R., & Bosch, M. J. (2020). When employees and supervisors (do not) see eye to eye on family supportive supervisor behaviours: The role of segmentation desire and work-family culture. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 121, 103471.
- Meier, L. L., & Spector, P. E. (2013). Reciprocal effects of work stressors and counterproductive work behavior: a five-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(3), 529.
- Menges, J. I., Tussing, D. V., Wihler, A., & Grant, A. M. (2017). When job performance is all relative: How family motivation energizes effort and compensates for intrinsic motivation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(2), 695-719.
- Mills, M. J., Matthews, R. A., Henning, J. B., & Woo, V. A. (2014). Family-supportive organizations and supervisors: how do they influence employee outcomes and for whom?. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(12), 1763-1785.
- Mills, M. J., Matthews, R. A., Henning, J. B., & Woo, V. A. (2014). Family-supportive organizations and supervisors: how do they influence employee outcomes and for whom?. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(12), 1763-1785.
- Mostafa, A. M. S., Boon, C., Abouarghoub, W., & Cai, Z. (2022). High-commitment HRM, organizational engagement, and deviant workplace behaviors: The moderating role of person-organization fit. *European Management Review*.
- Muthén, B., & Muthén, L. (2017). Mplus. In *Handbook of item response theory* (pp. 507-518). Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Nohe, C., Michel, A., & Sonntag, K. (2014). Family-work conflict and job performance: A diary study of boundary conditions and mechanisms. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(3), 339-357.
- Odle-Dusseau, H. N., Britt, T. W., & Greene-Shortridge, T. M. (2012). Organizational work-

- family resources as predictors of job performance and attitudes: The process of work–family conflict and enrichment. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 17(1), 28.
- Ohly, S., Sonnentag, S., Niessen, C., & Zapf, D. (2010). Diary studies in organizational research. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*.
- Oldham, G. R., & Cummings, A. (1996). Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work. *Academy of management journal*, 39(3), 607-634.
- Pan, S. Y. (2018). Do workaholic hotel supervisors provide family supportive supervision? A role identity perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 68, 59-67.
- Parkinson, B., Briner, R. B., Reynolds, S., & Totterdell, P. (1995). Time frames for mood: Relations between momentary and generalized ratings of affect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(4), 331-339.
- Preacher, K. J., Zyphur, M. J., & Zhang, Z. (2010). A general multilevel SEM framework for assessing multilevel mediation. *Psychological methods*, 15(3), 209.
- Qing, G., & Zhou, E. (2017). Bidirectional work–family enrichment mediates the relationship between family-supportive supervisor behaviors and work engagement. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 45(2), 299-308.
- Qing, G., Zhang, H., & Wang, Z. (2021). How and when family-supportive supervisor behaviors foster work engagement and gratitude: A moderated mediation model. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 49(1), 1-10.
- Repetti, R. L. (1989). Effects of daily workload on subsequent behavior during marital interaction: The roles of social withdrawal and spouse support. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 57(4), 651.
- Robinson, M. D., Persich, M. R., Stawicki, C., & Krishnakumar, S. (2019). Deviant workplace behavior as emotional action: Discriminant and interactive roles for work-related emotional intelligence. *Human Performance*, 32(5), 201-219.
- Rofcanin, Y., Berber, A., Koch, S., & Sevinc, L. (2016). Job crafting and I-deals: A study testing the nomological network of proactive behaviors. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(22), 2695-2726.
- Rofcanin, Y., de Jong, J. P., Las Heras, M., & Kim, S. (2018). The moderating role of prosocial motivation on the association between family-supportive supervisor behaviours and employee outcomes. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 107, 153-167.
- Rofcanin, Y., Las Heras, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2017). Family supportive supervisor behaviors and organizational culture: Effects on work engagement and performance. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 22(2), 207.

- Rofcanin, Y., Las Heras, M., Bosch, M. J., Berber, A., Mughal, F., & Ozturk, M. (2021). Servant leadership and family supportiveness: Looking into employees' work and family outcomes. *Journal of Business Research*, 128, 70-82.
- Rofcanin, Y., Las Heras, M., Escribano, P. I., & Stanko, T. (2020). FSSBs and elderly care: Exploring the role of organizational context on employees' overall health and work-family balance satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 35, 403-419.
- Russo, M., Buonocore, F., Carmeli, A., & Guo, L. (2018). When family supportive supervisors meet employees' need for caring: Implications for work-family enrichment and thriving. *Journal of Management*, 44(4), 1678-1702.
- Schreurs, B. H., Hetty van Emmerik, I. J., Günter, H., & Germeys, F. (2012). A weekly diary study on the buffering role of social support in the relationship between job insecurity and employee performance. *Human Resource Management*, 51(2), 259-279.
- Shalley, C. E., & Gilson, L. L. (2004). What leaders need to know: A review of social and contextual factors that can foster or hinder creativity. *The leadership quarterly*, 15(1), 33-53.
- Sianoja, M., Crain, T. L., Hammer, L. B., Bodner, T., Brockwood, K. J., LoPresti, M., & Shea, S. A. (2020). The relationship between leadership support and employee sleep. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 25(3), 187.
- Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 15-28.
- Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 15-28.
- 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.
- Ten Brummelhuis, L. L., Haar, J. M., & Roche, M. (2014). Does family life help to be a better leader? A closer look at crossover processes from leaders to followers. *Personnel Psychology*, 67(4), 917-949.
- Thoits, P. A. (1994). Stressors and problem-solving: The individual as psychological activist. *Journal of health and social behavior*, 143-160.
- Totterdell, P., Wood, S., & Wall, T. (2006). An intra-individual test of the demands-control model: A weekly diary study of psychological strain in portfolio workers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79(1), 63-84.
- Tremmel, S., & Sonnentag, S. (2018). A sorrow halved? A daily diary study on talking about

- experienced workplace incivility and next-morning negative affect. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(4), 568.
- Van Der Lippe, T. (2007). Dutch workers and time pressure: Household and workplace characteristics. *Work, employment and society*, 21(4), 693-711.
- Van Veldhoven, M. J. P. M., & Meijman, T. (1994). Het meten van psychosociale arbeidsbelasting met een vragenlijst: de vragenlijst beleving en beoordeling van de arbeid (VBBA).
- Veldhoven, M. V., & Meijman, T. (1994). Het meten van psychosociale arbeidsbelasting met een vragenlijst: de vragenlijst beleving en beoordeling van de arbeid (VBBA).
- Wang, S., Liu, Y., & Shalley, C. E. (2018). Idiosyncratic deals and employee creativity: The mediating role of creative self-efficacy. *Human Resource Management*, 57(6), 1443-1453.
- Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Hudy, M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: how good are single-item measures?. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 82(2), 247.
- Wei, J., Chen, Y., Zhang, Y., & Zhang, J. (2020). How does entrepreneurial self-efficacy influence innovation behavior? Exploring the mechanism of job satisfaction and Zhongyong thinking. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 708.
- Wo, D. X., Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2015). What drives trickle-down effects? A test of multiple mediation processes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(6), 1848-1868.
- 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.
- Yu, L., Buysse, D. J., Germain, A., Moul, D. E., Stover, A., Dodds, N. E., ... & Pilkonis, P. A. (2012). Development of short forms from the PROMIS™ sleep disturbance and sleep-related impairment item banks. *Behavioral sleep medicine*, 10(1), 6-24.
- Zhang, L., Jin, T., & Jiang, H. (2020). The mediating role of career calling in the relationship between family-supportive supervisor behaviors and turnover intention among public hospital nurses in China. *Asian Nursing Research*, 14(5), 306-311.
- Zhang, L., Jin, T., & Jiang, H. (2020). The mediating role of career calling in the relationship between family-supportive supervisor behaviors and turnover intention among public hospital nurses in China. *Asian Nursing Research*, 14(5), 306-311.

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations, and Reliabilities (on the Diagonal Between Brackets) of the Study Variables (Study 1)

	Variables	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>
1	Weeks	2.56	1.09				
2	Supervisor's spousal support	6.31	0.91	0.05	(0.93)		
3	FSSBs	5.66	1.33	0.05	0.25**	(0.73)	
4	Production Deviance	1.55	1.38	0.07	-0.32**	-0.26**	(0.93)

Notes. *: $p < .05$. **: $p < .01$. ***: $p < .001$.

N: : 25 supervisors, 68 employees over 4 weeks.

Table 2. Multilevel Path Analysis Results (Study 1)

Variables	Dependent variable: FSSBs						Dependent variable: Production Deviance		
	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	Estimate	SE	t	Estimate	SE	t	Estimate	SE	t
Intercept	5.78	2.17	2.66**	4.22	.82	5.15***	7.05	2.82	2.50*
Control Variables									
Age (Supervisor)	0.04	0.03	1.33	0.03	0.02	1.33	0.00	0.07	-0.04
Gender (Supervisor)	-0.88	0.39	-2.26*	-0.73	0.35	-2.05*	-0.03	0.99	-0.03
Tenure (Supervisor)	-0.04	0.03	-1.33	-0.03	0.02	-1.50	-0.03	0.06	-0.45
Number of Children (Supervisor)	0.22	0.22	1.00	0.21	0.16	1.25	0.04	0.47	0.09
Age (Subordinate)	-0.05	0.04	-1.25	-0.04	0.03	-1.45	-0.03	0.06	-0.47
Gender (Subordinate)	0.44	0.59	0.75	0.23	0.32	0.72	-0.36	0.56	-0.65
Tenure (Subordinate)	0.02	0.05	0.40	0.03	0.04	0.76	-0.01	0.06	-0.16
Number of Children (Subordinate)	0.26	0.15	1.73	0.13	0.13	0.99	-0.05	0.22	-0.23
Co-worker support	0.15	0.12	1.25	0.23	0.12	1.92*	-0.01	0.12	-0.08
Independent Variables									
Supervisor' spousal support				0.27	0.14	2.10*			
Mediator									
FSSBs (Subordinate rated)							-0.40	0.11	3.63***
Level 1 intercept variance (SE)	0.57	0.10	5.7***	0.55	0.10	5.50***	0.40	0.07	5.71***
Level 2 intercept variance (SE)	0.10	0.10	1.00	0.06	0.07	0.86	0.17	0.17	1.00
Level 3 intercept variance (SE)	0.00	0.17	0.02	0.00	0.09	0.02	1.25	0.61	2.05*

N: 25 supervisors, 68 employees over 4 weeks.

Table 3. Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations, and Reliabilities (on the Diagonal Between Brackets) of the Study Variables (Study 2)

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Weeks	3.31	1.18						
Week Level								
2 FSSBs	4.39	1.81	0.03	(0.95)				
3 Exhaustion	3.91	1.41	-0.05	-0.15**	(0.82)			
4 Creativity	4.12	1.53	0.03	0.35**	-0.17**	(0.82)		
5 Sleep quality	4.7	1.47	0.06*	0.16**	-0.45***	0.26**	(0.94)	
6 Dyadic adjustment	5.22	1.35	0.04	0.15**	-0.11**	0.22**	0.28**	(0.88)

Notes. *: $p < .05$. **: $p < .01$. ***: $p < .001$.

N: 237 employees over 4 weeks.

Table 4. Direct and Indirect Associations (Study 2)

Names of the Variables	Exhaustion			Creativity			Sleep quality			Dyadic adjustment		
	Final Model			Final Model			Final Model			Final Model		
Variables	Estimates	SE	t	Estimates	SE	t	Estimates	SE	t	Estimates	SE	t
Intercept	3.91	0.04	97.75	4.12	0.04	103	4.73	0.04	118.25	5.25	0.41	12.80
Weeks	-0.05	0.04	0.013	0.01	0.04	0.25	0.04	0.04	1.00	0.04	0.03	1.33
FSSBs	-0.14	0.03	-4.67***	0.31	0.03	10.33***	0.08	0.02	4.00***	0.12	0.03	4.00***
Exhaustion				-0.14	0.03	-4.67***	-0.45	0.03	-15.0***	-0.09	0.03	-3.00**
Level 1 intercept variance (SE)	0.85	0.55		1.1	0.48		0.35	0.61		1.36	0.23	
Level 2 intercept variance (SE)	1.11	0.54		0.93	0.48		1.33	0.61		0.41	0.22	

Notes. *: $p < .05$. **: $p < .01$. ***: $p < .001$.

N: 237 employees over 4 weeks.

Figure 1. Conceptual Model of Study 1






Figure 2. Results of Study 1



Notes. * p <.05; ** p <.01; *** p <.001. Standard errors are between parentheses.


N: 25 supervisors, 68 employees over 4 weeks.

Figure 3. Conceptual model of Study 2



Note. Dotted lines denote mediation.

Figure 4. Model Results of Study 2



Notes. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. Standard errors are between parentheses.
 N: 237 employees over 4 weeks.