

The Effect of Work Life Balance on Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention: The Moderating Role of Perceived Organizational Support*

Eunyoung Kim

Department of Business Administration, Chonbuk National University, South Korea.

Hyunsung Oh

Department of Business Administration, Chonbuk National University, South Korea.

Miaomiao Huo

Department of Business Administration, Chonbuk National University, South Korea.

Received 15 May 2017, Revised 3 July 2017; Accepted 18 August 2017

Abstract

The purpose of the current study is to examine the relationship between work life balance, organizational commitment (OC) and turnover intention (TIN) with the moderating effect of perceived organizational support. More specifically, this study analyzes how maintaining work life balance affects OC and employee's intention to leave, and explore if POS moderates the relationship between work life balance, OC and TIN. Ultimately, this study aims to stress the importance of work life balance and provide guidelines and insights to human resources professionals in order for them to enhance employee's perceptions of organizational support, strengthen OC and lower turnover rate. Results showed that the work-leisure and work-growth balance were found to be positively related to affective commitment (AC). The work-family balance was found to be positively related to continuance commitment (CC) and the work-growth balance was found to be positively related to normative commitment (NC). For the effects of the balance between work and life on TIN, TIN was found to be negatively related to both work-family balance and work-growth balance. Regarding the moderating effects of perceived organizational support (POS) on the relationship between work-life balance and OC, it was found that POS moderated the relationship between work-family balance and OC depending on the type of OC respectively. However, the effects of perceived emotional support on TIN also had no moderating effect. Therefore, this study suggests that human resource and training personnel need to provide institutional and emotional support by understanding the importance of maintaining work and life balance of employee to increase employees' productivity and commitment to the organization and decrease turnover rate. The implications of these results for the Effect of Work Life Balance on OC and TIN research and practices are discussed.

* Corresponding Author: H. Oh (tom6265@hanmail.net)

This paper complies with the ethical codes set by NRA and AJBC.

Keyword : Work Life Balance, Organizational Commitment, Turnover Intention, Perceived Organizational Support

1. Introduction

Perhaps it can be stated that it is part of life people may experience dispute between work and individual life as people continue to pursue the quality of life that people need and want. In a society where people now face new challenges such as global competition, family values, increasing participation of women in the workforce, and dual-earner and single parent families, the demand for work-life balance by employees and managers has been increasing at an unprecedented rate in the past few years, and finding a balance between work and life has become a predominant issue in the corporate and government sectors. Historically, work-life balance issues have been considered personal issues (Emslie and Hunt, 2009), and organizations have just provided to their workforce' needs such as paid maternity leave in the workplace and childcare service. Yet, along with environmental shifts and value changes of employees, workforce' desire for work-life balance has raised and organizations have now offered more active support of their employees' work-life balance (Thorntwaite 2004). Muse et al. (2008) argued that organizations pay their attention and make an effort to support employees in the modern business environment is inevitable if their business become successful as committed workforce are apt to produce better employee performance and low employee turnover (Meyer et al. 2002). Thus, the following section will present a conceptual account of the prior literature on work-life balance associated with organizational commitment, turnover intention and perceived organizational support.

2. Literature Review

Research on work-life balance in Korea has shifted from focusing on a 'work oriented' view to placing more importance on 'personal life', especially after the implementation of the five day work week system in July 2004. Previous research showed that work-life balance is associated with employee work-related outcomes (i.g., organizational commitment (OC), turnover intentions (TIN) (Grawitch et al. 2007, Huang et al. 2007, Lockwood 2003). An organization's efforts to help employees achieve work-life balance enhances perceptions of organizational support to the extent they signal to an employee that he or she is particularly valued by the organization, and in return, employees will be strongly committed to the organization (Loi et al. 2006). More specifically, work-life balance programs such as flexible work schedules, condensed working

week, and childcare assistance lead to employee OC, retention of qualified employees, job satisfaction, organizational effectiveness, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as well as reduced TIN (Lockwood 2003, Yucel 2012). Previous studies also showed that perceived organizational support (POS) is significantly associated with OC and TIN because it influences employees' willingness to work harder and become attached to the organization (Loi et al. 2006).

The purpose of this study was to examine the moderating effect of POS on the relationship between work-life balance, OC and TIN. Ultimately, this study aims to stress the importance of work-life balance and provide guidelines and insights for human resources professionals to enhance employees' perceptions of organizational support, strengthen OC, and lower turnover rate. The following sections will discuss each of these key concepts.

2.1. Work-Life Balance

Work-life balance is a state of equilibrium in which the demands of both an employee's job and personal life are equal (Lockwood 2003). According to Morf (1989), 'Work' mainly refers to one's job or task, work environment, and job-related value at the micro level. Previous studies define 'Life' as family life; therefore past work-life balance studies focused more on work-family conflict, work-family facilitation and enrichment (Edwards and Rothbard 2000, Greenhaus and Beutell 1985, Frone 2003, Greenhaus and Powell 2006). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) defined work and family life conflict as a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from work and family domains are mutually incompatible. Previous studies have focused on investigating how to achieve a 'balance' between work and life without considering the impact on employees' OC and TIN. Frone et al. (1992) stated that a balanced engagement in work and family roles is associated with individual well-being because such balance reduced work-family conflict and stress, both of which detract from well-being. Greenhaus et al. (2003) stressed that work-life balance is successfully attained when individuals are committed and satisfied across their work and life roles. Consequently, employees who have optimal work-life balance are more likely to remain with their organization.

Recent studies view 'Life' as non-work which includes all areas of personal and family life except work. However, this conceptualization of 'work' as being separate from 'family' or 'non-work' has always been unclear in the past and is still a matter of debate among researchers (Brocklehurst 2001).

This study considers 'Life' as non-work which is outside family responsibilities and aims to examine work-life balance as proposed by Kim and Park (2008) who divide work-life balance into three categories: work-family balance, work-leisure (social activ-

ities, health) balance and work-growth (education, personal development) balance. Employees who achieve a balance in these areas are thus more likely to remain committed to their organization and consequently have a lower turnover intention.

2.2. Organizational Commitment (OC)

OC is described as a psychological state that influences an individual's behavior and binds the individual to the organization, according to Meyer and Allen (1991). OC reflects the extent to which employees identify with an organization and are committed to its goals (Nitesh et al. 2013). In other words, it characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization and alters his or her decision to belong or not belong in the organization (Meyer and Allen 1991).

This study examines OC in terms of the three components in Meyer and Allen's (1990) model of OC: affective commitment (AC), normative commitment (NC) and continuance commitment (CC). The AC of OC refers to "employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization" (Meyer and Allen 1990). Employees with high AC correlate personal goals with goals of the organization and have a strong desire to be a part of the organization. Meyer and Allen (1997) claim that AC mainly develops through personal fulfillment and employees who associate their well-being with the organization are likely to form an affective attachment to the organization. AC has been found to correlate with a need for achievement, affiliation autonomy and locus of control and self-efficacy (Mathieu and Zajac 1990, Meyer et al. 2002). Therefore employees who perceive their organization as supporting them affectively will have a higher AC, and as a result, will be more likely to remain with their organization.

In contrast, CC refers to "commitment based on the costs that employees associate with leaving the organization" (Meyer and Allen 1990). Costs such as economic costs and social costs are related to the level of employees' CC and if the benefit of staying with an organization is insufficient, they are more likely to leave the organization (Aggarwal-Gupta et al. 2010, Becker 1960). In summary, these employees with CC feel that they 'need to' stay with the organization (Meyer and Allen 1990) rather than any strong desire to do so. CC positively correlates with absenteeism, stress and work-family conflict, but negatively correlates with job performance.

Finally, NC refers to "employees' feelings of obligation to remain with the organization" (Meyer and Allen 1990). NC has a positive relationship with work attendance, job performance, OCB (Meyer et al. 2002) and employees with high levels of NC feel that they 'ought to' remain in the organization (Meyer and Allen 1990). Meyer et al.'s (2002) conceptualization of NC includes reciprocity of benefits received from the organization.

Work-life balance measures implemented by an organization could fall under the category of benefits received, and thus strengthen employees' perceptions of organizational support which in turn would increase commitment to the organization. As such, with regard to effect of the work-life balance on OC, the following hypothesis is made:

Hypothesis 1: Work life balance will be positively related to organizational commitment.

2.3. Turnover Intention (TIN)

TIN is defined as the mediating factor between attitudes affecting intent to leave and leaving an organization (Glissmeyer et al. 2008). Much of the literature has focused on identifying the factors influencing TIN. There could be a range of influential factors in employees' decision to remain with their organization. For example, a study focusing on TIN of nurses showed that turnover intention was influenced by work-related factors such as time pressure and quality of care, lack of autonomy, work schedule difficulties, dissatisfaction with pay as well as work-related social support (Estryn-beehar et al. 2010).

Previous studies have found that OC has a strong negative relationship with TIN. This is because employees with higher OC are willing to go beyond the minimum requirements of their duties and are more likely to remain with the organization compared to employees with lower OC, therefore reducing TIN (Meyer and Allen 1991).

In a meta-analysis of the antecedents and correlation to employee turnover, organizational support was one of the main predictors of employee TIN (Griffeth et al. 2000). Employees who received family-responsive support from their organization, thus achieving greater work-life balance were also found to demonstrate stronger OC and lower TIN (Grover and Crooker 1995). As such, with regard to effect of the work-life balance on TIN, the following hypothesis is made:

Hypothesis 2: Work life balance will be negatively related to turnover intention.

2.4. Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

POS is a set of global beliefs that employees develop about the extent to which the organization cares about their well-being and values their contributions (Eisenberger et al. 1986). Employees who experience high levels of POS incorporate organizational membership into self-identity and develop a positive emotional bond, or affective attachment, to the organization, and they feel the need to reciprocate favorable organizational treatment with behaviors that benefit the organization (Eisenberger et al. 1986, Nitesh et al. 2013). Affective attachment or emotional support is intangible support in which organizations help employees feel that they value and acknowledge employees' contribution and respect them (Yang 2009). Employees with "affective attachment

would increase performance by (a) raising the tendency to interpret the organization's gains and losses as the employee's own, (b) creating evaluation biases in judging the organization's actions and characteristics, and (c) increasing the internalization of the organization's values and norms". In contrast, calculative involvement or instrumental support is a form of direct support in which organizations provide employees material and non-material goods such as pay, promotion, rewards and information in order for them to achieve work performance goals (Yang 2009).

In relation to POS, social exchange theory applies the norm of reciprocity to socio-emotional benefits and material benefits that are exchanged between employees and organizations (Blau 1964, Gouldner 1960, Shore et al. 2006). The exchanged resources may include material goods, information and socioemotional outcomes such as pay, promotion, rewards, approval, respect and caring (Shore et al. 2006, Nitesh et al. 2013). In addition, POS contributes to employee well-being by providing socioemotional needs such as affiliation and emotional support, according to organizational support theory (Eisenberger et al. 1997, Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002).

A Korean-based study on hotel employees' POS and organizational effectiveness identified two subcategories: operational or instrumental, and emotional support (Yang 2009). The study found that instrumental support has a significantly positive effect on job satisfaction, negative effect on TIN and no significant effect on OC. In addition, emotional support has a significantly positive effect on OC, negative effect on TIN and no significant effect on job satisfaction. On the other hand, both instrumental support and emotional support were found to have a positive relationship with empowerment and organizational trust. These findings indicate that strengthening instrumental support in an organization enhances employee's job satisfaction and fostering emotional support in an organization increases employee's OC. Furthermore, providing POS enhances employee's empowerment and organizational trust and decreases intention to leave. This study examines employees' POS, specifically instrumental support and emotional support (Eisenberger et al. 1990). It aims to investigate whether POS has a moderating effect between work-life balance and OC and consequently, on TIN. Thus, the following hypotheses are made:

Hypothesis 3: Perceived organizational support will have moderating effects between work life balance and organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 4: Perceived organizational support will have moderating effects between work life balance and turnover intention.

3. Method

3.1. Participants and procedures

A survey was conducted with employees from randomly selected companies in Korea. Total of 430 surveys were distributed and 387 surveys were collected. The response of 349 people was used for analysis (271 males and 78 females). In performing this present research, poorly-answered surveys were excluded among the collected data for statistical processing. Specific analysis measures used are as follows. First, the research performed frequency analysis to find the general characteristics of the research subjects. Second, the research assessed reliability test for each item and examined predictability, accuracy and others. Principle component analysis was used as a validity analysis to group inquiries based on the factors for further analysis. Next, this research employed correlation analysis in order to examine the relationships with relevant variables. For a closer look at the result of the correlation analysis, regression analysis was performed. The analysis in this research followed the significance level of $p < .05$.

3.2. Measures

3.2.1 Work Life Balance

Work-life balance is a state of equilibrium in which the demands of both a person's job and personal life are equal, according to Lockwood (2003). The sub-variables of work life balance are work-family balance, work-leisure balance and work-growth balance. Work life balance is measured with 25 items introduced by Kim and Park (2008) on a 5-point Likert Scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree).

3.2.2 Organizational Commitment (OC)

OC is a psychological state that influences individual's behavior and binds the individual to the organization, according to Meyer and Allen (1991). The sub-variables of OC are AC, CC and NC. OC is measured with 24 items introduced by Meyer and Allen (1990) on a 5-point Likert Scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree).

3.2.3 Turnover Intention

TIN is the mediating factor between attitudes affecting intent to leave and actually leaving an organization, according to Glissmeyer et al. (2008). TIN is measured with 4 items introduced by Mitchel (1981) and Moore (2000) on a 5-point Likert Scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree).

3.2.4 Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

POS is a set of global beliefs that employees develop about the extent to which the

organization cares about their well-being and values their contributions, according to Eisenberger et al. (1986). The sub-variables of POS are instrumental support and emotional support. Perceived organizational support is measured with 17 items introduced by Eisenberger et al. (1990) and Yang (2009), on a 5-point Likert Scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree).

4. Results

4.1. Descriptions of basic information of the participants

Table 1 shows the socioeconomic characteristics of the participants. Multiple regression analysis was conducted for the effects of work life balance factors on OC. As a result, it was found that as for VIF, no multicollinearity problem existed between model 1 and 2 for all sub-categories of OC. For the effects of work life balance factors on AC inserting gender and age as controlled variables, age showed to have significant effect in model 1 ($p<.01$). In model 2, work-family factors showed no significant effect and work-leisure factors showed $\beta = -.138$, exhibiting significant effect at the level of $p<.05$. Work-growth factors were found to have $\beta = .527$, having a significant positive effect ($p<.001$). The regression equation had the R^2 of 23%. Therefore, it was found that work-leisure and work-growth factors affected AC. For the effects of work life balance factors on CC, with gender and age as controlled variables, work-family factors showed $\beta = .121$, exhibiting significant effect at the level of $p<.05$. Work-leisure factors and work-growth factors were found to have no significant effect. Therefore, it was found that work-family factors affected CC. For the effects of work life balance factors on NC, with gender and age as controlled variables, work-family factors showed $\beta = -.322$, exhibiting significant effect at the level of $p<.001$. Work-growth factors showed $\beta = .243$, exhibiting significant positive effect ($p<.001$). Therefore, it was found that work-family factors and work-growth factors have effects on NC. In other words, if work-family factors increase, NC decreases, and if work-growth factors increase, NC increases.

Multiple regression analysis was performed for the effects of work life balance factors on TIN. As a result, it was found that as for VIF, no multicollinearity problem existed between 1 and 2. With gender and age as controlled variables, work-family factors showed $\beta = -.140$, exhibiting significant effect at the level of $p<.01$. Work-growth factors showed $\beta = -.340$, exhibiting significant negative effect ($p<.001$). Therefore, it was found that work-family factors and work-growth factors have effects on TIN. In other words, as work-family factors and work-growth factors increase, TIN decreases.

Moderated regression analysis was conducted for the effects of POS on work life balance and OC with age and gender as controlled variables.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

		Gender	Marriage	Age	High school graduation	2-year college
Education	Gender	(1)				
	Marriage	.204**	(1)			
	Age	.385**	.520**	(1)		
	High School	.161**	.061	.053	(1)	
	2-year college	.100	.018	.053	-.274**	(1)
	4-year college	-.219**	-.080	-.162**	-.494**	-.503**
	Graduate school	.009	.026	.128*	-.168**	-.171**
	Manu-facturing	.305**	.001	-.011	.508**	.359**
	General Mgmt.	-.251**	-.027	-.067	-.361**	-.219**
	Others	-.043	.035	.102	-.146**	-.151**
Work Life Balance	Position of work	.167**	.360**	.670**	-.152**	-.077
	Work-Family	-.145**	-.077	.000	-.106*	.013
	Work-Leisure	.025	-.006	.075	-.080	-.004
	Work-Growth	.048	.026	.096	-.103	-.005
Perceived Organizational Support	ES	.011	.010	.065	-.079	-.015
	IS	.000	.120*	.156**	.055	-.058
	AC	.145**	.079	.194**	-.026	.008
OC	CC	-.151**	.117*	.204**	.004	.047
	NC	.069	.000	.123*	.094	.050
TIN		-.138**	-.117*	-.274**	-.048	.002

Note: OC=organizational commitment, PW=position of work, ES=emotional support, IS=instrumental support, AC=affective commitment, CC=continuance commitment, NC=normative commitment, TIN=turnover intention.

Alpha coefficients are on the diagonal.

*p< .05, two-tailed. **p< .01, two-tailed

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

		4-year college	Graduate School	Manu- facturing	General Mgmt.	Others
Gender Marriage Age High School 2-year college 4-year college Graduate school Manu- facturing General Mgmt. Others	Education	(1)				
	Area of work	-.308**	(1)			
		-.584**	-.219**	(1)		
		.486**	-.016	-.692**	(1)	
		.075	.290**	-.312**	-.470**	(1)
Position of work		.049	.238**	-.361**	.188**	.194**
	Work-Family	.139**	-.107*	-.175**	.173**	-.013
	Work-Life Balance	.114*	-.078	-.165**	.185**	-.041
Work Life Balance	Work-Leisure	.136*	-.080	-.167**	.108*	.061
	Work- Growth					
Perceived Organizational Support	ES	.058	.031	-.053	.000	.064
	IS	-.003	.010	-.002	-.071	.096
	AC	.009	.010	-.027	-.038	.084
OC	CC	-.057	.026	.018	.049	-.086
	NC	-.098	-.034	.076	-.045	-.034
TIN		-.040	.133*	.017	.023	-.051

Note: OC=organizational commitment, PW=position of work, ES=emotional support, IS=instrumental support, AC=affective commitment, CC=continuance commitment, NC=normative commitment, TIN=turnover intention.

Alpha coefficients are on the diagonal.

*p< .05, two-tailed. **p< .01, two-tailed

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

		PW	Work-Family	Work-Leisure	Work-Growth	ES
	Gender					
	Marriage					
	Age					
	High School					
	2-year college					
	4-year college					
	Graduate school					
	Manufacturing					
	General Mgmt.					
	Others					
	Position of work	(1)				
	Work-Family	.058	(1)			
	Work-Leisure	.195**	.445**	(1)		
	Work-Growth	.229**	.391**	.684**	(1)	
	Perceived Organizational Support	ES	.220**	.015	.187**	.336**
		IS	.204**	.177**	.180**	.407**
		AC	.335**	.128*	.231**	.446**
		CC	.138**	.165**	.110*	.035
	OC	NC	.160**	-.199**	.083	.162**
						.365**
TIN		-.313**	-.299**	-.390**	-.471**	-.445**

Note: OC=organizational commitment, PW=position of work, ES=emotional support, IS=instrumental support, AC=affective commitment, CC=continuance commitment, NC=normative commitment, TIN=turnover intention.

Alpha coefficients are on the diagonal.

*p< .05, two-tailed. **p< .01, two-tailed

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

		IS	AC	CC	NC	TIN
	Gender					
	Marriage					
	Age					
	High School					
	2-year college					
Education	4-year college					
	Graduate school					
	Manu- facturing					
Area of work	General Mgmt.					
	Others					
	Position of work					
	Work-Family					
Work Life Balance	Work-Leisure					
	Work- Growth					
Perceived Organizational Support	ES					
	IS	(1)				
	AC	.670**	(1)			
OC	CC	.225**	.187**	(1)		
	NC	.370**	.408**	.223**	(1)	
	TIN	-.567**	-.664**	-.266**	-.358**	(1)

Note: OC=organizational commitment, PW=position of work, ES=emotional support, IS=instrumental support, AC=affective commitment, CC=continuance commitment, NC=normative commitment, TIN=turnover intention.

Alpha coefficients are on the diagonal.

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed

Table 2 Effects of Work Life Balance Factors on Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention

		Non-Standardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient	t	Significance Probability	R ²	F
		B	Standard Error	Beta				
Dependent variable: Affective Commitment								
1	(Constant)	3.146	.188		16.728	.000		
	Gender	-.143	.098	-.083	-1.458	.146	.044	7.88***
	Age	.145	.051	.162	2.850**	.005		
2	(Constant)	2.005	.237		8.474	.000		
	Gender	-.128	.089	-.074	-1.435	.152		
	Age	.112	.046	.125	2.441*	.015	.237	21.36***
	Work-Family	-.005	.050	-.005	-.099	.91		
	Work-Leisure	-.115	.056	-.13	-2.050*	.041		
	Work-Growth	.504	.063	.527	8.048***	.000		
Dependent variable: Continuance Commitment								
1	(Constant)	1.874	.183		10.224	.000		
	Gender	.467	.096	.270	4.888***	.000	.103	19.952***
	Age	.277	.050	.307	5.574***	.000		
2	(Constant)	.1543	.255		6.053	.000		
	Gender	.428	.096	.247	4.446***	.000		
	Age	.270	.049	.301	5.478***	.000	.127	10.003***
	Work-Family	.113	.054	.121	2.097*	.037		
	Work-Leisure	.094	.060	.112	15.61	.119		
	Work-Growth	-.102	.067	-.106	-1.516	.130		

Dependent variable: Normative Commitment								
1	(Constant)	2.516	.185		13.598	.000		
	Gender	-.043	.097	-.026	-.445	.657	.016	2. 753
	Age	.098	.050	.113	1.956	.051		
2	(Constant)	2.680	.247		10.867	.000		
	Gender	.054	.093	.032	.578	.564		
	Age	.093	.048	.108	1.955	.051	.119	9. 266 ***
	Work-Family	-.289	.052	-.322	-5.552***	.000		
	Work-Leisure	.043	.058	.053	.738	.461		
	Work-Growth	.225	.065	.243	3.450***	.001		
Dependent variable: Turnover Intention								
1	(Constant)	3.377	.244		13.820	.000		
	Gender	.087	.127	.038	.682	.496	.076	14. 315 ***
	Age	-.307	.066	-.260	-4.637***	.000		
2	(Constant)	5.437	.300		18.125	.000		
	Gender	.132	.113	.058	1.163	.246		
	Age	-.252	.058	-.213	-4.340***	.000	.299	29. 247 ***
	Work-Family	-.172	.063	-.140	-2.709**	.007		
	Work-Leisure	-.086	.071	-.078	-1.208	.228		
	Work-Growth	-.430	.079	-.304	-5.417***	.000		

Table 3 Effects of Perceived Instrumental Support on Affective Commitment

Model		Non-Standardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient	t	Significance Probability	R ²	F
		B	Standard Error	Beta				
1	(Constant)	2.005	.237		8.474	.000		
	Gender	-.128	.089	-.074	-1.435	.152		
	Age	.112	.046	.125	2.441	.015	.237	21.363***
	Work-Family	-.005	.050	-.005	-.099	.921		
	Work-Leisure	-.115	.056	-.138	-2.050*	.041		
	Work-Growth	.504	.063	.527	8.048***	.000		
2	(Constant)	1.228	.199		6.171	.000		
	Gender	-.196	.072	-.114	-2.716	.007		
	Age	.035	.037	.039	.935	.350		
	Work-Family	-.036	.040	-.039	-.892	.373	.506	58.401***
	Work-Leisure	-.014	.046	-.017	-.313	.754		
	Work-Growth	.217	.055	.227	3.974***	.000		
3	Instrumental Support	.592	.043	.581	13.638***	.000		
	(Constant)	1.827	.565		3.231	.001		
	Gender	-.181	.072	-.105	-2.521*	.012		
	Age	.047	.037	.052	1.256	.210		
	Work-Family	-.395	.140	-.427	-2.829**	.005		
	Work-Leisure	-.063	.193	-.076	-.327	.744		
	Work-Growth	.510	.173	.533	2.944**	.003		
	Instrumental Support	.356	.199	.350	1.792	.074	.523	41.244***
	Work-Family x Instrumental Support	.139	.050	.724	2.752**	.006		
	Work-Leisure x Instrumental Support	.015	.066	.076	.233	.816		
	Work-Growth x Instrumental Support	-.112	.060	-.558	-1.877	.061		

Table 4 Effects of Perceived Instrumental Support on Continuance Commitment

Model		Non-Standardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient	t	Significance Probability	R ²	F
		B	Standard Error	Beta				
1	(Constant)	1.543	.255		6.053	.000		
	Gender	.428	.096	.247	4.446***	.000		
	Age	.270	.049	.301	5.478***	.000	.127	10.003***
	Work-Family	.113	.054	.121	2.097*	.037		
	Work-Leisure	.094	.060	.112	1.561	.119		
	Work-Growth	-.102	.067	-.106	-1.516	.130		
2	(Constant)	1.239	.206		4.763	.000		
	Gender	.402	.094	.232	4.254***	.000		
	Age	.240	.049	.267	4.921***	.000		
	Work-Family	.101	.053	.108	1.911	.057	.168	11.494***
	Work-Leisure	.133	.060	.159	2.233*	.026		
	Work-Growth	-.214	.071	-.222	-3.001**	.003		
3	Instrumental Support	.232	.057	.226	4.082***	.000		
	(Constant)	-2.378	.700		-3.398	.001		
	Gender	.348	.089	.201	3.921***	.000		
	Age	.208	.046	.232	4.531***	.000		
	Work-Family	1.265	.173	1.360	7.320***	.000		
	Work-Leisure	.058	.239	.069	.242	.809		
	Work-Growth	-.357	.214	-.371	-1.667	.096		
	Instrumental Support	1.595	.246	1.556	6.482***	.000	.279	14.547***
	Work-Family x Instrumental Support	-.440	.062	-2.277	-7.045***	.000		
	Work-Leisure x Instrumental Support	.033	.082	.160	.403	.687		
	Work-Growth x Instrumental Support	.069	.074	.340	.930	.353		

Table 5 Effects of Perceived Instrumental Support on Normative Commitment

Model		Non-Standardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient	t	Significance Probability	R ²	F
		B	Standard Error	Beta				
1	(Constant)	1.543	.255		6.053	.000		
	Gender	.428	.096	.247	4.446***	.000		
	Age	.270	.049	.301	5.478***	.000	.127	10.003***
	Work-Family	.113	.054	.121	2.097*	.037		
	Work-Leisure	.094	.060	.112	1.561	.119		
	Work-Growth	-.102	.067	-.106	1.516	.130		
2	(Constant)	1.239	.260		4.763	.000		
	Gender	.402	.094	.232	4.254***	.000		
	Age	.240	.049	.267	4.921***	.000		
	Work-Family	.101	.053	.108	1.911	.057	.168	11.494***
	Work-Leisure	.113	.060	.159	2.233*	.026		
	Work-Growth	-.214	.071	-.222	-3.001**	.003		
3	Instrumental Support	.232	.057	.226	4.082***	.000		
	(Constant)	-2.378	.700		-3.398	.001		
	Gender	.348	.089	.201	3.921***	.000		
	Age	.208	.046	.232	4.531***	.000		
	Work-Family	1.265	.173	1.360	7.320***	.000		
	Work-Leisure	.058	.239	.069	.242	.809		
	Work-Growth	-.357	.214	-.371	-1.667	.096		
	Instrumental Support	1.595	.246	1.556	6.482***	.000	.279	14.547***
	Work-Family x Instrumental Support	-.440	.062	-2.277	-7.045***	.000		
	Work-Leisure x Instrumental Support	.033	.082	.160	.403	.687		
	Work-Growth x Instrumental Support	.069	.074	.340	.930	.353		

Table 6 Effects of Perceived Emotional Support on Affective Commitment

Model		Non-Standardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient	t	Significance Probability	R ²	F
		B	Standard Error	Beta				
1	(Constant)	2.005	.237		8.474	.000		
	Gender	-.128	.089	-.074	-1.435	.152		
	Age	.112	.046	.125	2.441*	.015	.237	21.363***
	Work-Family	-.005	.050	-.005	-.099	.921		
	Work-Leisure	-.115	.056	-.138	-2.050*	.041		
	Work-Growth	.504	.063	.527	8.048***	.000		
2	(Constant)	.682	.213		3.203	.001		
	Gender	-.172	.072	-.100	-2.394*	.017		
	Age	.089	.037	.100	2.419*	.016		
	Work-Family	.066	.040	.071	1.622	.106	.509	59.090***
	Work-Leisure	-.098	.045	-.117	-2.174*	.030		
	Work-Growth	.283	0.53	.296	5.362***	.000		
3	Emotional Support	.586	.043	.559	13.753***	.000		
	(Constant)	1.402	.638		2.198	.029		
	Gender	-.167	.073	-.097	-2.285	.023		
	Age	.086	.037	.096	2.327	.021		
	Work-Family	-.042	.153	-.045	-.274	.784		
	Work-Leisure	-.191	.206	-.229	-.927	.355		
	Work-Growth	.267	.196	.279	1.365	.173		
	Instrumental Support	.348	.206	.332	1.687	.093	.511	39.428***
	Work-Family xEmotional Support	.034	.049	.173	.699	.485		
	Work-Leisure xEmotional Support	.031	.068	.154	.458	.647		
	Work-Growth xEmotional Support	.006	.065	.028	.090	.928		

Table 7 Effects of Perceived Emotional Support on Continuance Commitment

Model		Non-Standardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient	t	Significance Probability	R ²	F
		B	Standard Error	Beta				
1	(Constant)	1.543	.255		6.053	.000	.127	10.003***
	Gender	.428	.096	.247	4.446***	.000		
	Age	.270	.049	.301	5.478***	.000		
	Work-Family	.113	.054	.121	2.097*	.037		
	Work-Leisure	.094	.060	.112	1.561	.119		
	Work-Growth	-.102	.067	-.106	-1.516	.130		
2	(Constant)	1.331	.285		4.672	.000	.134	8.830***
	Gender	.421	.096	.243	4.379***	.000		
	Age	.267	.049	.297	5.413***	.000		
	Work-Family	.124	.054	.133	2.295*	.022		
	Work-Leisure	.097	.060	.115	1.610	.108		
	Work-Growth	-.138	.071	-.143	-1.949	.052		
3	Emotional Support	.094	.057	.089	1.648	.100	.211	10.096***
	(Constant)	-.760	.816		-.932	.352		
	Gender	.366	.093	.211	3.927***	.000		
	Age	.262	.047	.291	5.524***	.000		
	Work-Family	1.047	.195	1.125	5.368***	.000		
	Work-Leisure	.116	.263	.139	.442	.659		
	Work-Growth	-.645	.251	-.670	-2.574**	.010		
	Instrumental Support	.794	.264	.752	3.011**	.0003		
	Work-Family x Emotional Support	-.314	.063	-1.570	-4.980***	.000		
	Work-Leisure x Emotional Support	-.003	.087	-.012	-.029	.977		
	Work-Growth x Emotional Support	.177	.083	.857	2.141*	.033		

Table 8 Effects of Perceived Emotional Support on Normative Commitment

Model		Non-Standardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient	t	Significance Probability	R ²	F
		B	Standard Error	Beta				
1	(Constant)	2.680	.247		10.867	.000		
	Gender	.054	.093	.032	.578	.564		
	Age	.093	.048	.108	1.955	.051	.119	9.266***
	Work-Family	-.289	.052	-.322	-5.552***	.000		
	Work-Leisure	.043	.058	.053	.738	.461		
	Work-Growth	.225	.065	.243	3.450***	.001		
2	(Constant)	1.963	.263		7.461	.000		
	Gender	.030	.089	.018	.338	.735		
	Age	.081	.046	.094	1.781	.076		
	Work-Family	-.251	.050	-.280	-5.019***	.000	.204	14.592***
	Work-Leisure	.052	.056	.065	.941	.348		
	Work-Growth	.106	.065	.114	1.618	.107		
3	Emotional Support	.318	.053	.313	6.036***	.000		
	(Constant)	4.244	.777		5.460	.000		
	Gender	.051	.089	.031	.579	.563		
	Age	.073	.045	.084	1.617	.107		
	Work-Family	-.650	.186	-.725	-3.495***	.001		
	Work-Leisure	-.200	.251	-.247	-.798	.426		
	Work-Growth	.090	.239	.097	.377	.707		
	Instrumental Support	-.440	.251	-.433	-1.750	.081	.229	11.167***
	Work-Family x Emotional Support	.130	.060	.672	2.157*	.032		
	Work-Leisure x Emotional Support	.084	.083	.428	1.014	.311		
	Work-Growth x Emotional Support	.006	.079	.032	.081	.936		

Table 9 Effects of Perceived Instrumental Support on Turnover Intention

Model		Non-Standardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient	t	Significance Probability	R ²	F
		B	Standard Error	Beta				
1	(Constant)	5.437	.300		18.125	.000		
	Gender	.132	.113	.058	1.163	.246		
	Age	-.252	.058	-.213	-4.340***	.000	.299	29.247***
	Work-Family	-.172	.063	-.140	-2.709**	.007		
	Work-Leisure	-.086	.071	-.078	-1.208	.228		
	Work-Growth	-.430	.079	-.340	-5.417***	.000		
2	(Constant)	6.229	.276		22.607	.000		
	Gender	.201	.100	.088	2.011*	.045		
	Age	-.174	.052	-.147	-3.359***	.001		
	Work-Family	-.140	.056	-.115	-2.507*	.013	.459	48.272***
	Work-Leisure	-.188	.063	-.171	-2.972**	.003		
	Work-Growth	-.138	.076	-.109	-1.821	.069		
3	Instrumental Support	-.604	.060	-.448	-10.042***	.000		
	(Constant)	5.421	.791		6.852	.000		
	Gender	.201	.100	.088	2.002	.046		
	Age	-.174	.052	-.147	-3.341***	.001		
	Work-Family	-.029	.195	-.024	-.149	.881		
	Work-Leisure	.279	.270	.253	1.035	.302		
	Work-Growth	-.460	.242	-.363	-1.897	.059		
	Instrumental Support	-.322	.278	-.239	-1.156	.248	.465	32.803***
	Work-Family x Instrumental Support	-.043	.071	-.169	-.606	.545		
	Work-Leisure x Instrumental Support	-.164	.093	-.606	-1.768	.078		
	Work-Growth x Instrumental Support	.118	.083	.444	1.410	.159		

Table 10 Effects of Perceived Emotional Support on Turnover Intention

Model		Non-Standardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient	t	Significance Probability	R ²	F
		B	Standard Error	Beta				
1	(Constant)	5.437	.300		18.125	.000		
	Gender	.132	.113	.058	1.163	.246		
	Age	-.252	.058	-.213	-4.340**	.000	.299	29.247***
	Work-Family	-.172	.063	-.140	-2.709**	.007		
	Work-Leisure	-.086	.071	-.078	-1.208	.228		
	Work-Growth	-.430	.079	-.340	-5.417***	.000		
2	(Constant)	6.518	.311		20.971	.000		
	Gender	.168	.105	.074	1.599	.111		
	Age	-.234	.054	-.198	-4.345***	.000	.403	38.401***
	Work-Family	-.229	.059	-.188	-3.883***	.000		
	Work-Leisure	-.100	.066	-.090	-1.517	.130		
	Work-Growth	-.250	.077	-.197	-3.242***	.001		
3	Emotional Support	-.479	.062	-.346	-7.701***	.000		
	(Constant)	5.449	.930		5.857	.000		
	Gender	.152	.106	.067	1.426	.155		
	Age	-.231	.054	-.196	-4.280***	.000		
	Work-Family	0.12	.223	.010	.054	.957		
	Work-Leisure	-.111	.300	-.101	-.371	.711		
	Work-Growth	-.185	.286	-.146	-.647	.518		
	Emotional Support	-.120	.301	-.087	-.400	.689	.405	25.670***
	Work-Family x Emotional Support	-.080	.072	-.303	-1.106	.270		
	Work-Leisure x Emotional Support	.005	.099	.018	.049	.961		
	Work-Growth x Emotional Support	-.022	.094	-.082	-.235	.814		

For the effects of perceived instrumental support on affected commitment, controlled variables were inserted into model 1. In model 2, work life balance was inserted and R^2 was found to be 23%. In model 3, the instrumental support was entered and R^2 was 50%. In model 4, moderating variables were entered in order to examine the moderation effect, and found that the interaction effect of work-family and instrumental support was .724 which has a positive effect ($p < .01$). The R^2 of regression equation was 52%. The other variables were found to have no moderating effect. Based on the findings above, it was found that the work-family factors have moderating effects between the instrumental support and AC.

For the effects of perceived instrumental support on CC, gender and age were inserted as controlled variables in model 1. In model 2, work-life balance was inserted and R^2 was found to be 12%. In model 3, the instrumental support was entered and R^2 was 16%. In model 4, moderating variables were entered in order to examine the moderation effect, and found that the interaction effect of work-family and instrumental support was -2.27 which has a negative effect ($p < .001$). The R^2 of regression equation was 14%. The other variables were found to have no moderating effect. Based on the findings above, it was found that the work-family factors have moderating effects between the instrumental support and CC.

For the effects of perceived instrumental support on NC, controlled variables were inserted in model 1 and work life balance was inserted in model 2. R^2 was found to be 11%. In model 3, the instrumental support was entered and R^2 was 23%. In model 4, moderating variables were entered in order to examine the moderation effect, and found that the interaction effect of work-leisure and instrumental support was .898 which has a positive effect ($p < .05$). The R^2 of regression equation was 15%. The other variables were found to have no moderating effect. Based on the findings above, it was found that the work-leisure factors have moderating effects between the instrumental support and NC.

For the effects of perceived emotional support on AC, controlled variables were inserted into model 1 and work life balance was inserted into model 2. R^2 was found to be 23%. In model 3, the perceived emotional support was entered and R^2 was 50%. In model 4, moderating variables were entered in order to examine the moderation effect, and none of the variables were found to have moderating effect.

For the effects of perceived emotional support on CC, controlled variables were inserted into model 1 and work life balance was inserted into model 2. R^2 was found to be 12%. In model 3, the perceived emotional support was entered and R^2 was shown as 13%. In model 4, moderating variables were entered in order to examine the moderation effect, and found that the interaction effect of work-family and emotional support

was -1.57 which has a negative effect ($p < .001$). The interaction effect of work-growth and emotional support also had significant effect ($p < .05$). The R^2 of regression equation was 21%. Based on the findings above, it was found that the work-family factors have moderating effects between the emotional support and CC.

For the effects of perceived emotional support on NC, controlled variables were inserted into model 1 and work life balance was inserted into model 2. R^2 was found to be 11%. In model 3, the emotional support was entered and R^2 was 20%. In model 4, moderating variables were entered in order to examine the moderation effect, and found that the interaction effect of work-family and emotional support was .672 which has a positive effect ($p < .05$). The R^2 of regression equation was 20%. The other variables were found to have no moderating effect. Based on the findings above, it was found that the work-family factors have moderating effects between the emotional support and NC.

For moderated regression analysis on the effects of perceived instrumental support on TIN, controlled variables were inserted into model 1 and work life balance was inserted into model 2. R^2 was found to be 29%. In model 3, the instrumental support was entered and R^2 was 45%. In model 4, moderating variables were entered in order to examine the moderation effect, and none of the variables were found to have moderating effect.

For moderated regression analysis on the effects of perceived emotional support on TIN, controlled variables were inserted into model 1 and work life balance was inserted into model 2. R^2 was found to be 29%. In model 3, the emotional support was entered and R^2 was 40%. In the 4th model, moderating variables were entered in order to examine the moderation effect, and found that none of the variables were found to have moderating effect.

5. Discussion

5.1. Research Summary and Contributions

The study was conducted in order to analyze how maintaining work-life balance affects OC and TIN, and examine whether POS moderates the relationship between work-life balance, OC, and TIN.

Firstly, in terms of work-life balance and its effect on OC, the work-leisure and work-growth balance were found to be positively related to AC. The work-family balance was found to be positively related to CC and the work-growth balance was found to be positively related to NC. Secondly, for the effects of the balance between work and life on TIN, TIN was found to be negatively related to both work-family balance and work-growth balance. As for whether POS would moderate the relationship between

work-life balance and OC, it was found that perceived instrumental support moderated the relationship between work-family balance and AC. Perceived instrumental support was also found to moderate the relationship between work-family balance and CC. In addition, perceived instrumental support was found to moderate the relationship between work-leisure balance and NC. The effects of perceived emotional support on AC had no moderating effect. Similarly, perceived emotional support had no moderating effect on CC. Perceived emotional support was found to moderate the relationship between work-family balance and NC. Finally, the effects of perceived instrumental support on TIN had no moderating effect. The effects of perceived emotional support on TIN also had no moderating effect. The study results showed that work-life balance increases employees' OC and decreases TIN. In addition, an organization's instrumental support and emotional support moderated the relationship between work-life balance and OC. Therefore, human resource and training personnel need to provide institutional and emotional support by understanding the importance of maintaining work and life balance of employees. They also should improve work-life balance programs, especially programs related to work-family, work-leisure and work-growth balance. This will increase employees' productivity and commitment to the organization and decrease turnover rate.

5.2. Limitations of research and future research

The limitations of this study and suggestions for further research are as follows. First, as convenience sampling was used, further research is necessary to produce generalizable results. It would be useful in future research to collect samples from a wider range of participants to demonstrate the effectiveness of diverse moderating variables. Second, since the balance of work and life is subjective and might vary according to personal, environmental, and cultural characteristics, it is necessary to construct and measure more diverse sub-variables of constructs with the balance between work and life. This study focused on analyzing three sub-variables of work life balance - a balance between work and family, work and leisure, and work and growth. Future research could be expanded to examine a wider range of areas associated with work in order to gain more detailed results.

References

- Kim, C. & Park C. (2008). A Study on the Development of a 'Work-Life Balance' Scale. *Journal of Leisure Studies*, 5(3) 53~69.
- Yang H. K. (2009). A Study on Hotel Employees' Perceived Organizational Support and

- Organizational Effectiveness, Graduate School of Sejong University.
- Aggarwal-Gupta, M., Vohra, N., & Bhatnagar, D. (2010). Perceived organizational support and organizational commitment: The mediational influence of psychological well-being. *Journal of Business and Management*, 16(2), 105
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32-42.
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Brocklehurst, M. (2001). Power, identity and new technology homework: Implications for 'new forms of organizing'. *Organization Studies*, 22(3), 445-466.
- Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 178-199.
- Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. D. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 812-820.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(1), 51-59.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507.
- Emslie, C., & Hunt, K. (2009). 'Live to work' or 'work to live'? A qualitative study of gender and work-life balance among men and women in mid-life. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 16(1), 151-172.
- Estryn-Behar, M., van der Heijden, B. I., Fry, C., & Hasselhorn, H. M. (2010). Longitudinal analysis of personal and work-related factors associated with turnover among nurses. *Nursing Research*, 59(3), 166-177.
- Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology*, 143-162. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 65-78.
- Grawitch, M. J., Tares, S., & Kohler, J. M. (2007). Healthy workplace practices and employee outcomes. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14(3), 275.
- Glissmeyer, M., Bishop, J. W., & Fass, R. D. (2008). Role conflict, role ambiguity and intention to quit the organization: the case of law enforcement. *Academy of Man-*

- agement *Journal*, 40(1), 82-111.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 165-167.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles, *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 76-88.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work-family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 510-531.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 72-92.
- Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, 26, 463-488.
- Grover, S. L., & Crooker, K. J. (1995). Who appreciates family-responsive human resource policies: The impact of family-friendly policies on the organizational attachment of parents and non-parents. *Personnel psychology*, 48(2), 271-288.
- Huang, T. C., Lawler, J., & Lei, C. Y. (2007). The effects of quality of work life on commitment and turnover intention. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 35(6), 735-750.
- Lockwood, N. R. (2003). Work/life balance: Challenges and solutions. *HR Magazine*, 48(6), 1-1.
- Loi, R., Hang-yue, N., & Foley, S. (2006). Linking employees' justice perceptions to organizational commitment and intention to leave: The mediating role of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 101-120.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. (1990). A Review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A Three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective continuance and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of anteced-

- ents, correlations and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52.
- Mitchel, J. O. (1981). The effects of intentions, tenure, personal, and organizational variables on managerial turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 742-751.
- Moore, J. E. (2000). Why is this happening? A causal attribution approach to work exhaustion consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, 2, 335-349.
- Morf, M. (1989). *The work/life dichotomy: Prospects for reintegrating people and jobs*. New York: Quorum Books.
- Muse, L., Harris, S. G., Giles, W. F., & Feild, H. S. (2008). Work-life benefits and positive organizational behavior: is there a connection?. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(2), 171-192.
- Nitesh, S., Nanda Kumar, V. M., & Asok Kumar S. (2013). Role of pay as perceived organizational support contributes to employee's organizational commitment. *Advances in Management*, 6(8).
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 698-714.
- Shore, L. M., Tetrick, L. E., Lynch, P., & Barksdale, K. (2006). Social and economic exchange: Construct development and validation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(4), 837-867.
- Thorntwaite, L. (2004). Working time and work-family balance: A review of employees' preferences. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 42(2), 166-184.
- Yucel, I. (2012). Examining the relationships among job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention: An empirical study. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(20).