WORK-LIFE CONFLICT, BURNOUT, AND THE ROLE OF SOCIAL SUPPORT

by

Madison M. Perry

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts in Industrial/Organizational Psychology

Middle Tennessee State University

July 2024

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Patrick McCarthy, Chair

Dr. Judith Van Hein

ABSTRACT

The present study examined the relationship between work-life conflict (WLC) and burnout, as well as how social support from both work and nonwork sources may impact that relationship. Participants (n=179) participated in a survey containing six questionnaires. The first two measured both directions of WLC: life interfering with work (LIW) and work interfering with life (WIL). The remaining questionnaires addressed social support from nonwork sources (friends, family, significant other), social support from work sources (supervisor and coworker) and the three dimensions of burnout (emotional exhaustion, cynicism, reduced personal accomplishment). Results showed that WIL and overall WLC were related to all three burnout dimensions while LIW was only related to reduced personal accomplishment. Additionally, each type of social support was significantly negatively related to each of the three burnout dimensions. We also found support for nonwork social support as a moderator between overall WLC and emotional exhaustion and cynicism, but not reduced personal accomplishment. Supervisor support and coworker support was supported as a moderator between overall WLC and all three burnout dimensions. When considering WIL rather than overall WLC, moderation analyses remained the same except for nonwork social support and cynicism, where nonwork social support did not moderate the relationship. These findings show the importance of social support in buffering the effects of strain to reduce symptoms of burnout. Understanding these dynamics can help organizations improve their employee's well-being by developing strategies to improve upon the social support for employees.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In the rapidly changing landscape of the American contemporary workforce, where diverse family structures intersect with evolving work dynamics, the relationship between work and personal life has become a pivotal concern to both employees and organizations. Research into the topic of the work-life interface catapulted in the 1960s, when there were ongoing social and workplace changes (Lewis & Cooper, 1999). More women, even those with children, were entering into male-dominated careers and the emerging technology of the time gave hope for a leisure age with less time spent at work (Lewis & Cooper, 1999). By the 1970s, society was recognizing the dual-earner family, and many men could no longer expect the support of a full-time stay at home wife (Lewis & Cooper, 1999).

Although the American work ethic remains strong, recent years have seen a shift towards prioritizing personal and family lives, which people are less inclined to set aside for the sake of work (Lockwood, 2003). The COVID-19 pandemic impacted the workforce by forcing employees to work from home, which created a new work-family dynamic due to the blurred lines between work and home life (Elbaz et al., 2023). Consequently, Americans are actively seeking ways to balance both their personal and family lives, striving for a harmonious combination of all aspects (Lockwood, 2003). This shift has led to a decreasing acceptance of the American working philosophy that once demanded employees prioritize work over personal and family commitments (Lockwood, 2003).

This evolving landscape not only highlights the changing dynamics of work and life but also brings to the forefront an issue of paramount importance – the detrimental effects of the conflicts between one's role at work and one's role outside of work. Work-life conflict (WLC)

has been linked to a variety of health and well-being outcomes. In a 2018 study (Gisler et al., 2018), the literature was reviewed concerning WLC and employee health. The findings showed that WLC negatively impacted an individual's psychological (e.g., burnout, depression, anxiety), physical (e.g., general health, cardiometabolic issues), and behavioral health (e.g. physical activity, sleep, alcohol use). While there are several negative outcomes resulting from WLC, burnout has been the most frequently studied (Gisler et al., 2018).

Burnout is an occupational hazard for both individuals and organizations, as it has been shown to lead to turnover intentions and actual turnover, reduced organizational commitment, job dissatisfaction, as well as physical health issues such as headaches, gastrointestinal disorders, muscle tension, and sleep disturbances (Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Maslach & Leiter, 2008). Burnout develops from a state of chronic emotional and interpersonal stressors on the job (Maslach et al., 2001). Maslach et al. (1997, p. 209) define burnout as "a state of exhaustion in which one is cynical about the value of one's occupation and doubtful of one's capacity to perform." This definition incorporates the three dimensions of burnout which are emotional exhaustion, depersonalization or cynicism, and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach et al., 1997). Additionally, increasing technology and ways to communicate have led to increasing pressures for employees. A 2016 study found that an increase in work-related communication outside of work has been associated with higher levels of work-family conflict and burnout (Ferguson et al., 2016). While there are numerous studies to support the relationship between work-life conflict and burnout (Brauchli et al., 2011; Demerouti et al., 2016; Reichl et al., 2014), inconsistencies in the literature remain.

The first inconsistency in the WLC and burnout literature is whether cynicism/depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment are as central to burnout as

emotional exhaustion. Emotional exhaustion is the most frequently studied dimension and is considered central to burnout (Maslach et al., 2001). Some researchers argue that the subscale of emotional exhaustion itself is a better measure of burnout (Koeske & Koeske, 1989), or even that the other two dimensions are unnecessary (Shirom, 1989). While exhaustion may be an important aspect of burnout, it fails to include all aspects of burnout that the other two dimensions account for. Work-family conflict, a more specific type of WLC, has been shown to have the strongest relationship with exhaustion, followed by cynicism, and personal accomplishment (Demerouti et al., 2016). The second inconsistency in the literature regarding the relationship between WLC and burnout is what role social support plays, from both work (i.e., supervisor, coworkers) and nonwork sources (i.e., family, friends, community memberships). Social support is viewed as a coping mechanism for stress (Cohen & Wills, 1985; House, 1981), although the mechanism by which this occurs is unclear (Koniarek & Dudek, 1996; Kshtriya et al., 2020). The most frequently studied models of the role of social support are the mediator and the moderator models, which are discussed in more detail later in this review.

The present study aims to find further support for the relationship between WLC and burnout and the impact social support has on reducing the likelihood of burnout. The results of this study can have a positive impact on both individuals and organizations. Supporting the relationship between WLC and burnout will further strengthen the literature; additionally, determining how social support may buffer the impact of burnout can help individuals and organizations get the appropriate resources they need to mitigate burnout. Parasuraman and Greenhaus (2002) documented that segments of the workforce may be subject to unique work/family pressures, yet often have few sources of support.

The topics introduced in this introduction will be elaborated upon in the upcoming literature review, which will systematically examine the variables of interest and their significance within the context of this study.

Burnout

Although experiencing stress from work is a common experience, a chronic state of job stress may lead to burnout (Brewer & Shapard, 2004). An individual's internal experience of job stress or strain is known to mediate the relationship between the impact of one's job demands (stressors) and work-related outcomes (e.g., absenteeism or reduced performance; Maslach & Leiter, 2008). Burnout develops as a response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stressors in one's job, which impacts job satisfaction, performance, turnover, and employee health (Khamisa et al., 2013; Shoji et al., 2016). The term burnout is a metaphor for a flame or fire being extinguished; unless additional resources are provided, the fire will diminish (Schaufeli et al., 2009). This fire represents an employee's ability to perform their job and feel a meaningful impact of their work (Schaufeli et al., 2009). Gaining a clear understanding of burnout is crucial for organizations to make decisions aimed to reduce burnout in employees, therefore improving retention and employee performance, and reducing costs related to employee health.

Burnout Dimensions

The most widely accepted definition of burnout is within the multidimensional theory of burnout which proposes there are three primary dimensions of burnout: emotional exhaustion, cynicism or depersonalization, and reduced accomplishment (Maslach et al., 2001).

The first dimension, emotional exhaustion refers to an employee's feelings of being drained of emotional resources; they lack the energy required for everyday tasks and have no source to replenish these depleted emotional resources. The second dimension, cynicism or

depersonalization refers to a negative and detached response to those around you; this detachment from others stems from the need to protect oneself from additional depleted resources. The third and final dimension of burnout is reduced personal accomplishment. This refers to a decline in feelings of competence stemming from the inability to cope with the demands of the job (Maslach et al., 2001). Maslach (1998) further conceptualized emotional exhaustion as the burnout dimension to represent the basic stress component, cynicism or depersonalization represents the interpersonal facet of burnout, and reduced personal accomplishment represents the self-evaluation dimension of burnout. While exhaustion is the most widely reported and studied dimension throughout the burnout literature, it's important to consider the interplay of the other two dimensions (Maslach et al., 2001).

Although exhaustion may be critical to burnout and captures the impact of job stress, it fails to include the impact on the interpersonal (cynicism and depersonalization) and self-evaluation (reduced personal accomplishment) aspects of burnout. Feelings of exhaustion prompt individuals to put distance between themselves and their work to cope with the feelings of exhaustion and work overload (Reichl et al., 2014). Depersonalization occurs as a coping mechanism from chronic exhaustion and manifests as cyclical attitudes towards one's work and dehumanized perceptions of others (Reichl et al., 2014). These cyclical attitudes are an attempt to distance oneself with work by making demands more manageable, and this reaction of distancing from exhaustion is found consistently in the burnout literature (Maslach et al., 2001).

Most Prominent Burnout Dimension Debate

Out of the three dimensions, exhaustion is the most obvious manifestation of burnout, and some researchers argue that the subscale of emotional exhaustion itself is a better measure of

burnout (Koeske & Koeske, 1989), or even that the other two dimensions are unnecessary (Shirom, 1989).

If one was to consider emotional exhaustion alone, the other facets of burnout would not be captured (Maslach et al., 2001). For example, feelings of emotional exhaustion prompt individuals to put distance between themselves and their work to cope with the feelings of exhaustion and work overload (Reichl et al., 2014). Depersonalization occurs as a coping mechanism from this chronic exhaustion and then can manifest as cyclical attitudes towards one's work and dehumanized perceptions of others (Reichl et al., 2014). These cyclical attitudes are an attempt to distance oneself with work by making demands more manageable, and this reaction of distancing from exhaustion is found consistently in the burnout literature (Maslach et al., 2001). The relationship of reduced personal accomplishment may be related to the other two dimensions of burnout in two ways. First, reduced personal accomplishment may be produced by exhaustion, cynicism or depersonalization, or a combination of the two. For example, a work environment where an individual feels chronically strained may lead the individual do lose a sense of their effectiveness. Secondly, reduced personal accomplishment may also develop in "parallel with the other two burnout aspects, rather than sequentially" (Maslach et al., 2001, p. 403).

Conservation of Resources Theory and Burnout

Conservation of resources (COR) theory can help to explain how the stress from job demands can lead to negative outcomes, such as burnout (Hobfoll, 1989). COR theory proposes that individuals have a set number of resources, and they try their best to obtain and protect those resources. In the COR theory, Hobfoll (1989) proposes these resources may be objects, conditions, personal characteristics, and energies.

Firstly, objects have a physical presence; some examples can include tools, housing, or other material objects. Secondly, condition resources are structures or states, such as social relationships, status at work, or health condition (Prapanjaroensin et al., 2017). Thirdly, personal characteristics are resources that reflect traits of an individual, such as personality traits and coping skills. The fourth and final category of resources that individuals value is referred to as energy, which represents the skills and abilities an individual possesses that can be used in exchange for other resources such as time, money, and knowledge (Alvaro et al., 2010).

The COR model theorizes that stress results from a threat to a loss of an individual's resources, the actual loss of resources, or the insufficient gain of resources to replenish lost resources (Halbesleben, 2006). Burnout in the work context can result from an individual feeling stressed due to one of these perceptions of depleting resources, particularly because the job demands are using more resources than the employee can replenish (Halbesleben, 2006). The initial threat to a loss of resources is the stressor, while the prolonged effort to protect and replenish those resources can lead to burnout (Hobfoll, 2001).

Outcomes of Burnout

Burnout has frequently been associated with several negative health and work-related outcomes (Cooper & Quick, 2017). A 2007 study found that 90 percent of respondents with severe burnout (classified as a daily occurrence of burnout symptoms) reported a physical or mental illness, where musculoskeletal pain and depression were the most frequently reported problems (Ahola, 2007).

Negative health outcomes from burnout range from behavioral outcomes to mental and physical health consequences. Burnout has been shown to be related to physical diseases such as cardiovascular problems (Toker et al., 2012), Type 2 diabetes (Melamed et al., 2006; Toker et al.,

2005), and mental illnesses such as depression and anxiety (Greenglass & Burke, 1990). The mechanism by which burnout and ill health is related is not fully understood. One possible explanation may be due to the overactivation of the fight or flight response which seems to have a biological impact on the development of diseases (Brunner, 1997). Another plausible explanation is the relationship between burnout and ill health is reversed, where an individual struggling with ill health is more likely to experience burnout due to health-related stressors being added on top of work-related stressors (Donders et al., 2007).

In addition to negative health outcomes, burnout has also been shown to be associated with several negative work outcomes such as job withdrawal that includes absenteeism, intention to leave the job, and actual turnover (Maslach et al., 2001). For those individuals experiencing burnout but do not actually leave the job, lower productivity and negative attitudes can be seen (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004; Maslach et al., 2001). One of the most hypothesized and studied outcomes of burnout is reduced job performance (Brandes et al., 2008; Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004; Maslach & Zimbardo, 1982).

Work-Life Conflict

Individuals can have several different roles in their lives, and these roles not only provide structure and meaning, but also impact individuals in several ways (Frone, 2003). The social roles of an individual not only influences their actions, but also how they interact and with whom, how they think and feel about things, as well as boundaries of time and space being imposed to fulfill the roles (Frone, 2003). This incompatibility of roles is referred to as role conflict (or more specifically, interrole conflict) where two more role pressures occur at the same time; where fulfilling one role pressure makes filling another role pressure more difficult (Kahn et al., 1964). Work-life conflict (WLC) refers to the interrole conflict between one's role at work

and one's role outside of work. This conflict may arise when the demands outside of work (such as family commitments, community memberships, and hobbies) negatively influence the ability to fulfill one's role in the work domain, or vice versa.

Bidirectional Nature of Work-Life Conflict

Since WLC deals with two competing roles, this conflict is bidirectional in nature (Frone et al., 1992). This conflict can manifest as either work interfering with life (WIL) or as life interfering with work (LIW). Each direction of conflict has their own set of antecedents and outcomes. While there are two directions WLC can occur, both WIL and LIW conflict has shown to be related to exhaustion and cynicism (Reichl et al., 2014). Although both directions of WLC seem to be related to burnout, several researchers have argued that it is important to differentiate between WIL and LIF (Carlson et al., 2000; Netemeyer et al., 1996)

In a 2018 study, Nichols and Swanberg conducted a confirmatory factor analysis with a one-factor model (overall WLC) and a two-factor model (WIL and LIW) using a ten-item measure of WLC. They found that all items in the two-factor model loaded significantly onto only one construct (either WIL or LIW) and were more strongly related compared to the one-factor model. Additionally, they noted no cross-loaded items in the two-factor model which supports discriminant validity between both directions of WLC (Nichols & Swanberg, 2018). This evidence supports the idea that WIL and LIW are distinct, but related forms of interrole conflict and differentiating between them provides stronger results as compared to lumping them together (Carlson et al., 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Netemeyer et al., 1996).

Outcomes of Work-Life Conflict

Work-life conflict can have several impacts on an employee including psychological, behavioral, and health-related outcomes (Gisler et al., 2018). An example of a health-related

outcome was found by Allen and Armstrong (2006) who found that family interfering with work (FIW) was associated with less physical activity and eating more high-fat foods, while work interfering with family (WIF) was associated with eating fewer healthy food options. Psychological outcomes have included depression (Zhang et al., 2017), anxiety (Frone, 2000), distress (Minnotte et al., 2013), and burnout (Brauchli et al., 2011).

In a 2011 Swiss study, a sample of 6,091 male and female employees were selected from four different large-scale enterprises that included various economic sectors (e.g. healthcare and banking) and occupational groups (e.g. nurses and administrative staff). Participants completed a questionnaire regarding various work and life conditions, and they found that both time-based work intergering with life (WIL) and life interfering with work (LIW) were found to be significant predictors of burnout (Brauchli et al., 2011).

Evidence to support that negative outcomes of burnout increase over time was found in a three-wave longitudinal study where work-self conflict was associated with higher levels of exhaustion over time (Demerouti et al., 2016). Additionally, both WIL and LIW are strongly related to exhaustion and cynicism (Reichl et al., 2014).

Social Support

There have been numerous studies interested in the relationship between social support and several work-related outcomes such as job performance, job satisfaction, and burnout (Schaufeli & Greenglass, 2001; Song et al., 2021). As discussed previously, the COR theory can help to explain how stress, and eventually burnout, can result from either resources that have been lost or are unable to be replenished (Hobfoll, 2001). The social support that individuals receive is a key social resource that serves to protect and replenish our resources (Seiger & Wiese, 2009). The COR theory can further help to illustrate how social support can influence the

experience of burnout since social support can create more opportunities for resources or replenish other resources that may be diminishing (Halbesleben, 2006). For example, an employee experiencing a stressful time at work may differentially feel the symptoms of stress or burnout depending on the social support they're receiving. This employee may receive one-on-one time with their supervisor, which may reduce uncertainties and lead to less stress. In line with the COR theory, the employee reduced the symptoms of stress or burnout by replenishing lost resources (unknown information) with social support provided by their supervisor.

Forms of Social Support

Social support may come in the form of both work and nonwork sources. Work social support is received from work-related relationships such as coworkers or supervisors, while nonwork social support can be from anywhere outside of work such as community memberships (e.g., sports teams, church groups), friends, or family. While several studies have shown that social support and burnout are statistically significantly related (Baruch-Feldman et al., 2002; Schaufeli & Greenglass, 2001), there has been mixed evidence on the impact of different sources of social support on the experience of burnout. One study found work support to be more closely associated with emotional exhaustion than depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment (Halbesleben, 2006). Another study found all three dimensions of burnout to be associated with work support (Tang & Li, 2021). While it's clear there is a relationship between social support and burnout, this study aims to investigate how different forms of social support influence the different dimensions of burnout.

Role of Social Support

While there is clear evidence to support the notion that social support can have a positive influence on the symptoms of stress and burnout, the processes by which this occurs is still

unclear. This unspecified role of social support has been a topic of interest throughout the literature, and the leading models view social support as either a mediating or moderating variable.

The stress buffering hypothesis, which views social support as a moderator, has been widely used to investigate the relationship between stressors and strain (Carlson & Perrewé, 1991; Cohen & Wills, 1985). The stress buffering model proposes that social support serves as a protective barrier, or buffer, to reduce the strength of the relationship between stressors and strain (Carlson & Perrewé, 1991). Carlson & Perrewé (1991) proposed a model that views social support as a moderator between work and family stressors and work-family conflict. For example, an employee may be experiencing a lack of clarity in their job role which may cause stress; receiving social support at work, such as an assigned mentor, can reduce symptoms of strain (work-family conflict) via the mentor providing guidance (Carlson & Perrewé, 1991). Throughout the burnout literature, many studies have found evidence of social support buffering against burnout (Burke & Greenglass, 1995; Carr et al., 1996; Greenglass et al., 1997). On the other hand, many studies have found little to no evidence of a buffering effect for social support (Burke & Greenglass, 1993, 1996; Koniarek & Dudek, 1996). Despite the inconclusive findings, social support as a moderating variable continues to be a dominant hypothesis throughout the occupational stress literature (Gore, 1987; Huynh et al., 2013; Seiger & Wiese, 2009).

Although the moderating or stress buffering model is widely cited, the mediating model of social support has also found support throughout the literature (Quittner et al., 1990; Song et al., 2021; Sun et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2021). This alternative hypothesis is that social support is a mediating, or intervening variable, where social support lies along the causal path between stressors and strain (Carlson & Perrewé, 1991). In this model, the mobilization of one's resources

are considered. More specifically, when an individual perceives a stressor in their environment, they will seek out resources as a coping mechanism, thus reducing the effects of stress (Carlson & Perrewé, 1991).

Having thoroughly examined the existing relevant literature, we will now proceed to present the formulated hypotheses that will guide our study.

Hypotheses

WLC and Burnout

Hypothesis 1: Overall work-life conflict (life interfering with work and work interfering with life combined) will be significantly positively related to each of the three burnout dimensions (emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced personal accomplishment).

Hypothesis 1a: Life interfering with work will be significantly positively related to each of the three burnout dimensions (emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced personal accomplishment).

Hypothesis 1b: Work interfering with life will be significantly positively related to each of the three burnout dimensions (emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced personal accomplishment).

Social Support and Burnout

Hypothesis 2: Work-related social support (supervisor support) will be significantly negatively related to each of the three burnout dimensions (emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced personal accomplishment).

Hypothesis 2a: Work-related social support (coworker support) will be significantly negatively related to each of the three burnout dimensions (emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced personal accomplishment).

Hypothesis 2b: Nonwork-related social support will be significantly negatively related to each of the three burnout dimensions (emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced personal accomplishment).

Social Support Moderation

Hypothesis 3: Nonwork-related social support will significantly moderate the relationship between overall work-life conflict and each of the three dimensions of burnout (emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced personal accomplishment).

Hypothesis 3a: Work-related social support (supervisor support) will significantly moderate the relationship between overall work-life conflict and each of the three dimensions of burnout (emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced personal accomplishment).

Hypothesis 3b: Work-related social support (coworker support) will significantly moderate the relationship between overall work-life conflict and each of the three dimensions of burnout (emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced personal accomplishment).

CHAPTER II: METHOD

Participants

Participants were recruited via Prolific and screened for requirements to participate in the study. We required participants to be at least 18 years old and employed full-time for at least six months to ensure responses were not given during the initial adjustment period of a new job. Out of the 205 individuals who either began or finished the survey, 26 were removed for either failing to meet the eligibility criteria or failing two or more attention checks. Therefore, the final sample consisted of 179 participants.

The majority of the sample was female (63%) and participants had mostly been in their full-time position for either two to five years (35%) or more than five years (38%). Additionally, most of the sample was white/Caucasian (67%), followed by black/African American (15%). The sample identified a wide range of industries they work in such as education (20%) and healthcare (15%). There was a variety of types of job roles, with the most being a considered a trained professional (36%) or either in junior or middle management (29%). When asked whether they have children living at home, 37% said that they did. Further information regarding descriptive statistics of the sample can be found in Appendix A.

Procedure

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Middle Tennessee State University under protocol IRB-FY2024-140. The approval letter can be found in Appendix B. Data was collected via an online Qualtrics survey in 2024 through Prolific. Measures were presented to the participant in the order they are described below. Prior to the start of the survey, participants were asked to give informed consent before answering demographic questions and screening questions to determine eligibility for the study. They were asked their gender and age

group as well as the following screening questions: “Which of the following best describes your type of employment?” and “How long have you been in your current position?” If a participant failed the screening questions, they were not permitted to restart or retake the survey. If the participant correctly answered the screening questions, they were permitted to move onto the survey.

Attention check items were included throughout the survey to ensure the participant is actively reading and appropriately responding to items. The first attention check item was shown as the fourth item in the Work-Family Conflict Scale (Netemeyer et al., 1996). and read, “Choose ‘Strongly agree’ for quality control purposes”. The second attention check item was shown as the tenth item on the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach et al., 1997) and read, “Choose ‘Never’ for quality control purposes”. The third attention check item was shown as the tenth item on the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS; Zimet et al., 1988) and read, “Choose ‘Neutral’ for quality control purposes”. Participants who failed to accurately answer at least two out of three of the attention check items were removed from the study. After completing the survey, participants were debriefed, thanked for their time and participation and given a code to receive $2 in compensation.

Measures

The materials for this online survey included screening questions, demographic questions, and the following six measures that measure dimensions of WLC, burnout, and social support, as further described below.

Work-Life Conflict

The Work-Family Conflict (WFC) Scale and the Family-Work Conflict (FWC) Scale, found in Appendix C and Appendix D respectively, were used to assess both directions of WLC

(Netemeyer et al., 1996). Both scales have five items. Since these scales aim to measure a more specific form of WLC, work-family conflict, the items were reworded to reflect the broader scope of work-life conflict. For example, an item that read, “My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties” was changed to, “My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill nonwork or personal duties.” The original items along with the revised items can be found in Appendices C and D. The WFC Scale measures work interfering with life (WIL) conflict, and the FWC Scale measures life interfering with work (LIW) conflict. Response options are on a 7-point Likert scale and range from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 7 (*strongly disagree*). For consistency purposes throughout the measures, we changed this 7-point Likert scale to range from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Both scales were previously validated by Netemeyer et al. (1996) with three samples and showed adequate levels of internal consistency, with coefficient alphas ranging from .88 to .89 for WFC and .82 to .90 for FWC. Discriminant validity was also shown across all three samples for both scales. Construct validity was shown through significant correlations with numerous on-job and off-job variables such as burnout, job tension, and intention to leave (Netemeyer et al., 1996).

Responses on both scales were averaged, and higher scores represent a higher level of conflict. Scores on each scale were also be combined to create an index of overall WLC, therefore providing three scores (WIL, LIW and overall WLC).

Social Support

Nonwork social support. Nonwork social support was measured with the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS; Zimet et al., 1988), which is a 12-item self-report measure that captures the participants' perceived support from family, friends,

and significant others (see Appendix E). Responses were given on a 7-point Likert scale and ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Internal consistency has previously been shown to be acceptable for all three sources, including the significant other (α=.91), family (α=.87), and friends (α=.85); and Cronbach's alpha for the entire scale has been shown in previous research to be .88 (Zimet et al., 1988). All three sources were combined for an overall nonwork social support score. Scores are averages of responses, and higher scores represent higher levels of social support.

Work social support. In the context of the present study, we tested work support with both a coworker support measure and a supervisor support measure. Rather than combine these measures into an overall work-related social support scale, we kept them separate to determine if there are differences depending on the source of work support. Supervisor support was measured with a nine-item scale used previously by researchers (Beutell, 2010; Minnotte, 2012) as seen in Appendix F. Response options range from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*) (Minnotte, 2012). Scores are averages of responses, and higher scores indicate more support. Additionally, internal reliability has been shown to be acceptable (α=.90; Minnotte, 2012).

Coworker support was measured with a ten-item scale where nine of the ten items are original items previously used by researchers (Ladd & Henry, 2000) (See Appendix G). The additional item was adapted from the eighth item of the supervisor support scale (Beutell, 2010; Minnotte, 2012) where the word "supervisor" was changed to "coworkers" to read, "My coworkers are understanding when I have family/personal business." This additional item aims to add an aspect of work-life balance perceptions involving support from coworkers that is captured in the supervisor support scale. Additionally, internal reliability for the original nine item scale has been shown to be acceptable (α=.88; Ladd & Henry, 2000). Response options were a 4-point

Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*). Scores are averages of responses, and higher scores indicate more support.

Burnout

The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI; Appendix H) was originally developed to measure job burnout and has three subscales including emotional exhaustion (nine items, $\alpha = .87$), depersonalization (seven items, $\alpha = .76$), and reduced personal accomplishment (eight items, $\alpha = .82$; Maslach et al., 1997). Items are on a 7-point Likert scale and range from 0 (*never*) to 6 (*every day*). Sample items from this copyrighted measure can be found in Appendix H. Negatively worded items were reverse coded, then responses were averaged. Higher scores represent higher levels of each dimension of burnout. The scoring processes was done separately for each dimension, giving three subdimension scores representing burnout.

Before submitting their survey, participants were asked to answer a few more demographic questions: “Which race or ethnicity best describes you?”, “What type of industry do you currently work in (regardless of your actual position)?”, “Which of the following best describes your role in your organization?”, and “Do you currently have children living at home?”

CHAPTER III: RESULTS

Prior to hypothesis testing, reliability analyses were conducted to determine whether the reliability of the scales is sufficient. Cronbach's alpha for each of the six scales was acceptable and ranged from .91 to .95 (See Table 1). Descriptive statistics for each of the variables can be found in Table 2.

Table 1

Reliability Analysis for All Scales

Scales	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Work-Family Conflict Scale*	5	.95
Family-Work Conflict Scale*	5	.93
Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support	12	.94
Supervisor Support Scale	9	.94
Perceived Coworker Support Scale*	10	.92
Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI)	16	.91

*Revised from original scale

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for All Variables

Variable	Likert Scale	*M*	*SD*
Work interfering with life (WIL) Conflict	1-7	3.88	1.65
Life interfering with work (LIW) Conflict	1-7	2.55	1.33
WLC (LIW and WIL Combined)	1-7	3.22	1.24
Nonwork Social Support	1-7	5.52	1.18
Supervisor Social Support	1-4	3.12	.63
Coworker Social Support	1-4	3.07	.50
MBI: Emotional Exhaustion (EE)	0-6	2.36	1.06
MBI: Cynicism (CYN)	0-6	2.44	.98
MBI: Reduced Personal Accomplishment (RPA)	0-6	3.10	1.53

Note. n=179

Work-Life Conflict and Burnout Dimension Correlations

Hypotheses 1, 1a, and 1b hypothesized that both directions of work-life conflict (WLC), including life interfering with work (LIW) conflict and work interfering with life (WIL) conflict, as well as overall WLC (LIW and WIL combined) would be significantly positively related to each dimension of burnout including emotional exhaustion (EE), cynicism (CYN), and reduced personal accomplishment (RPA). Hypothesis 1 was supported, as significant positive correlations were found between overall WLC and each dimension of burnout (See Table 3), although the relationship was stronger for CYN and RPA as compared to EE. Hypothesis 1a, which states that LIW will have a significant positive correlation with each of the three burnout dimensions was partially supported. LIW did not have a significant correlation with EE and CYN but did have a

significant correlation with RPA. Additionally, the mean for LIW was lower than the mean for WIL, therefore the experience of less LIW may make it more difficult to detect relationships. Hypothesis 1b was supported as a significant positive correlation was found between WIL and each dimension of burnout. Unexpectedly, LIW was not significantly related to all three of the burnout dimensions, as was WIL. Therefore, combining both directions of WLC into an overall score may obscure true relationships.

Table 3

Correlations Between Work-Life Conflict Variables and Dimensions of Burnout

Variable	Emotional Exhaustion	Cynicism	Reduced Personal Accomplishment
Work-Life conflict	.186*	.396**	.422**
Life Interfering with Work Conflict	.105	.146	.190*
Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.195*	.476**	.480**

* p<.05

** p<.001

Burnout and Social Support Correlations

Hypothesis 2, 2a, and 2b hypothesized relationships between different types of social support and each dimension of burnout. Hypothesis 2, which stated that work-related social support, specifically supervisor support, would be significantly negatively related to each of the three burnout dimensions. This was supported, as a significant negative relationship was seen between supervisor social support and emotional exhaustion (See Table 4). Hypothesis 2a was also supported by a significant negative relationship between work support from coworkers and each of the three burnout dimensions. Hypothesis 2b stated that social support from nonwork

sources (friends, family, significant others) would be significantly negatively related to each of the three burnout dimensions and was also supported.

Table 4

Correlations Between Social Support Variables and Dimensions of Burnout

Variable	Emotional Exhaustion	Cynicism	Reduced Personal Accomplishment
Supervisor Social Support	-.356**	-.423**	-.355**
Coworker Social Support	-.401**	-.302**	-.341**
Nonwork Social Support	-.275**	-.245**	-.226*

* p<.05

** p<.001

Hypotheses 3, 3a, and 3b hypothesized that different types of social support would moderate the relationship between overall work-life conflict (WLC) and each of the three burnout dimensions.

Nonwork Social Support Moderation Analysis

Hypothesis 3 states that perceived social support from nonwork sources would moderate the relationship between overall work-life conflict (WLC) and each of the three burnout dimensions. This was tested by running three regression analyses, each comparing two models. The first regression analysis compared two models, the first with WLC and emotional exhaustion (EE), and the second added the moderator of nonwork social support. Model 1 was statistically significant, R^2=.035, F(1, 177)=6.365, p=.013 as well as Model 2, R^2=.065, F(2,176)=6.112, p=.003. Results showed that while both models were significant, Model 2 significantly increased the variation explained by adding the moderator (R^2 Change=.03, p=.018). The coefficients for

these models can be found in Table 5. Results indicated that greater WLC was associated with greater EE (*B*=.159, *SE*=.063, β=.186, *p*=.013) and the interaction between WLC and nonwork social support was significant (*B*=.-.049, *SE*=.021, β=-.336, *p*=.018), suggesting that the effect of WLC on EE depended on the level of nonwork social support. The negative beta indicated that the moderator of nonwork social support weakened the relationship between WLC and EE.

Table 5

Regression: Emotional Exhaustion, Work-Life Conflict, and Nonwork Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.839	.217	8.457	-	<.001	[1.410, 2.268]
	Work-Life Conflict	.159	.063	2.523	.186	.013	[.035, .284]
2	Constant	1.906	.216	8.805	-	<.001	[1.479, 2.333]
	Work-Life Conflict	.406	.121	3.363	.474	<.001	[.168, .643]
	WLCxNonworkSS**	-.049	.021	-2.385	-.336	.018	[-.090, -.008]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Overall Work-Life Conflict*Nonwork Social Support

The second regression analysis compared Model 1 containing work-life conflict (WLC) and cynicism (CYN) with Model 2 containing WLC and CYN with nonwork social support as a moderator. Model 1 was statistically significant, R^2=.157, F(1, 177)=32.889, p<.001 as well as Model 2, R^2=.177, F(2,176)=18.923, p<.001. Results showed that while both models were significant, Model 2 significantly increased the variation explained by adding the moderator (R^2 Change=.02, p=.039). The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 6. Results indicated that greater WLC was associated with greater CYN (*B*=.313, *SE*=.055, β=.396, *p*<.001) and the interaction between WLC and nonwork social support was significant (*B*=.-.037,

SE=.018, β=-.276, *p*=.039), suggesting that the effect of WLC on CYN depended on the level of nonwork social support. The negative beta indicated that the moderator of nonwork social support weakened the relationship between WLC and CYN.

Table 6

Regression: Cynicism, Work-Life Conflict, and Nonwork Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.437	.188	7.632	-	<.001	[1.065, 1.808]
	Work-Life Conflict	.313	.055	5.735	.396	<.001	[.206, .421]
2	Constant	1.487	.188	7.908	-	<.001	[1.116, 1.858]
	Work-Life Conflict	.500	.105	4.774	.632	<.001	[.293, .707]
	WLCxNonworkSS**	-.037	.018	-2.083	-.276	.039	[-.073, -.002]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Overall Work-Life Conflict*Nonwork Social Support

Similarly, the third regression analysis compared Model 1 containing WLC and reduced personal accomplishment (RPA) with Model 2 which contained WLC and RPA with nonwork social support as a moderator. Model 1 was statistically significant, R^2=.178, F(1, 177)=38.269, p<.001 as well as Model 2, R^2=.191, F(2,176)=20.935, p<.001. Results showed that while both models were significant, Model 2 did not significantly increase the variation explained by adding the moderator (R^2 Change=.014, p=.078). The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 7. Results indicated that greater WLC was associated with greater RPA (*B*=.523, *SE*=..084, β=..422, p<.001) and the interaction between WLC and nonwork social support was not significant (*B*=-.049., *SE*=.028., β=-.620., *p*=<.001), suggesting that the effect of WLC on CYN did not depend on the level of nonwork social support. Results partially supported Hypothesis 3

since Model 2 added significant variability explained when considering EE and CYN as the dependent variable, but not RPA. This tells us that we gain additional predictive ability with the relationship between WLC and EE and WLC and CYN by adding nonwork social support as a moderator, but not between WLC and RPA.

Table 7

Regression: Reduced Personal Accomplishment, Work-Life Conflict, and Nonwork Social Support

Model		B	SE	t	β	p	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.423	.291	4.891	-	<.001	[.849, 1.997]
	Work-Life Conflict	.523	.084	6.186	.422	<.001	[.356, .689]
2	Constant	1.490	.292	5.108	-	<.001	[.914, 2.065]
	Work-Life Conflict	.769	.162	4.733	.620	<.001	[.448, 1.090]
	WLCxNonworkSS**	-.049	.028	-1.771	-.232	.078	[-.104, .006]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Overall Work-Life Conflict*Nonwork Social Support

Supervisor Social Support Moderation Analysis

Hypothesis 3a states that social support from a supervisor would moderate the relationship between overall work-life conflict (WLC) and each of the three burnout dimensions. This hypothesis was analyzed using the same methods as Hypothesis 3. The first regression analysis used the burnout dimension of emotional exhaustion (EE); Model 1 was statistically significant, R^2=.035, F(1, 177)=6.365, p=.013 as well as Model 2, R^2=.117, F(2,176)=11.626, p<.001. Results showed that while both models were significant, Model 2 significantly increased the variation explained by adding the moderator (R^2 Change=.082, p<.001). The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 8. Results indicated that greater WLC was associated with

greater EE (*B*=.159, *SE*=.063, β=.186, *p*=.013) and the interaction between WLC and supervisor social support was significant (*B*=-.146, *SE*=.036, β=-556., *p*<.001), suggesting that the effect of WLC on EE depended on the level of supervisor social support. The negative beta indicated that the moderator of supervisor social support weakened the relationship between WLC and EE.

Table 8

Regression: Emotional Exhaustion, Work-Life Conflict, and Supervisor Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.839	.217	8.457	-	<.001	[1.410, 2.268]
	Work-Life Conflict	.159	.063	2.523	.186	.013	[.035, .284]
2	Constant	1.961	.211	9.303	-	<.001	[1.545, 2.377]
	Work-Life Conflict	.567	.118	4.819	.663	<.001	[.335, .799]
	WLCxSupervisorSS**	-.146	.036	-4.042	-.556	<.001	[-.217, -.075]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Overall Work-Life Conflict*Supervisor Social Support

The second regression analysis used the burnout dimension of cynicism (CYN); Model 1 was statistically significant, R^2=.157, F(1, 177)=32.889, p<.001 as well as Model 2, R^2=.250, F(2,176)=29.272, p<.001. Results showed that while both models were significant, Model 2 significantly increased the variation explained by adding the moderator (R^2 Change=.093, p<.001). The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 9. Results indicated that greater WLC was associated with greater CYN (*B*=.313, *SE*=.055, β=.396, *p*<.001) and the interaction between WLC and supervisor social support was significant (*B*=-.144, *SE*=.031, β=-592, *p*<.001), suggesting that the effect of WLC on CYN depended on the level of supervisor social

support. The negative beta indicated that the moderator of supervisor social support weakened the relationship between WLC and CYN.

Table 9

Regression: Cynicism, Work-Life Conflict, and Supervisor Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.437	.188	7.632	-	<.001	[1.065, 1.808]
	Work-Life Conflict	.313	.055	5.735	.396	<.001	[.206, .421]
2	Constant	1.557	.180	8.653	-	<.001	[1.202, 1.912]
	Work-Life Conflict	.715	.100	7.122	.904	<.001	[.517, .914]
	WLCxSupervisorSS**	-.144	.031	-4.668	-.592	<.001	[-.205, -.083]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Overall Work-Life Conflict*Supervisor Social Support

The third regression analysis used the burnout dimension of reduced personal accomplishment (RPA); Model 1 was statistically significant, R^2=.178, F(1, 177)=38.269, p<.001 as well as Model 2, R^2=.228, F(2,176)=26.037, p<.001. Results showed that while both models were significant, Model 2 significantly increased the variation explained by adding the moderator (R^2 Change=.051, p<.001). The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 10. Results indicated that greater WLC was associated with greater RPA (B=.523, SE=.084, β=.422, p<.001) and the interaction between WLC and supervisor social support was significant (B=-.166, SE=.049, β=-.437, p<.001), suggesting that the effect of WLC on RPA depended on the level of supervisor social support. The negative beta indicated that the moderator of supervisor social support weakened the relationship between WLC and RPA. Therefore,

Hypothesis 3a was supported due to social support from a supervisor moderating the relationship between overall WLC and each of the three burnout dimensions.

Table 10

Regression: Reduced Personal Accomplishment, Work-Life Conflict, and Supervisor Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.423	.291	4.891	-	<.001	[.849, 1.997]
	Work-Life Conflict	.523	.084	6.186	.422	<.001	[.356, .689]
2	Constant	1.562	.286	5.468	-	<.001	[.998, 2.126]
	Work-Life Conflict	.987	.159	6.188	.796	<.001	[.672, 1.302]
	WLCxSupervisorSS**	-.166	.049	-3.395	-.437	<.001	[-2.63, -.070]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Overall Work-Life Conflict*Supervisor Social Support

Coworker Social Support Moderation Analysis

Hypothesis 3b stated that social support from a coworker would moderate the relationship between overall WLC and each of the three burnout dimensions. This hypothesis was also analyzed using the same methods as Hypothesis 3 and 3a. The first regression analysis used the burnout dimension emotional exhaustion (EE); Model 1 was statistically significant, R^2=.035, F(1, 177)=6.365, p=.013 as well as Model 2, R^2=.126, F(2,176)=12.669, p<.001. Results showed that while both models were significant, Model 2 significantly increased the variation explained by adding the moderator (R^2 Change=.091, p<.001). The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 11. Results indicated that greater WLC was associated with greater EE (B=.159, SE=.063, β=.186, p=.013) and the interaction between WLC and coworker social support was significant (B=-.202, SE=.047, β=-.745, p<.001), suggesting that the effect of WLC on EE

depended on the level of coworker social support. The negative beta indicated that the moderator of coworker social support weakened the relationship between WLC and EE.

Table 11

Regression: Emotional Exhaustion, Work-Life Conflict, and Coworker Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.839	.217	8.457	-	<.001	[1.410, 2.268]
	Work-Life Conflict	.159	.063	2.523	.186	.013	[.025, .284]
2	Constant	1.939	.209	9.287	-	<.001	[1.527, 2.352]
	Work-Life Conflict	.742	.149	4.987	.868	<.001	[.448, 1.035]
	WLCxCoworkerSS**	-.202	.047	-4.284	-.745	<.001	[-.296, -.109]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Overall Work-Life Conflict*Coworker Social Support

The second regression analysis used the burnout dimension of cynicism (CYN); Model 1 was statistically significant, R^2=.157, F(1, 177)=32.889, p<.001 as well as Model 2, R^2=.204, F(2,176)=22.509, p<.001. Results showed that while both models were significant, Model 2 significantly increased the variation explained by adding the moderator (R^2 Change=.047, p=.002). The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 12. Results indicated that greater WLC was associated with greater CYN (B=.313, SE=.044, β=.396, p<.001) and the interaction between WLC and coworker social support was significant (B=-.135, SE=.042, β=-.535, p=.002), suggesting that the effect of WLC on CYN depended on the level of coworker social support. The negative beta indicated that the moderator of coworker social support weakened the relationship between WLC and CYN.

Table 12

Regression: Cynicism, Work-Life Conflict, and Coworker Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.437	.188	7.632	-	<.001	[1.065, 1.808]
	Work-Life Conflict	.313	.055	5.735	.396	<.001	[.206, .421]
2	Constant	1.503	.185	8.144	-	<.001	[1.139, 1.868]
	Work-Life Conflict	.701	.131	5.330	.885	<.001	[.441, .960]
	WLCxCoworkerSS**	-.135	.042	-3.223	-.535	.002	[-.217, -.052]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Overall Work-Life Conflict*Coworker Social Support

The third regression analysis used the burnout dimension of reduced personal accomplishment (RPA); Model 1 was statistically significant, R^2=.178, F(1, 177)=38.269, p<.001 as well as Model 2, R^2=.243, F(2,176)=28.259, p<.001. Results showed that while both models were significant, Model 2 significantly increased the variation explained by adding the moderator (R^2 Change=.065, p<.001). The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 13. Results indicated that greater WLC was associated with greater RPA (B=.523, SE=.084, β=.422, p<.001) and the interaction between WLC and coworker social support was significant (B=-.248, SE=.064, β=-.631, p<.001), suggesting that the effect of WLC on RPA depended on the level of coworker social support. The negative beta indicated that the moderator of coworker social support weakened the relationship between WLC and RPA. Therefore, Hypothesis 3b was supported due to the additional variability explained between the relationship between WLC and each of the three burnout dimensions by adding the moderating term of coworker social support.

Table 13

Regression: Reduced Personal Accomplishment, Work-Life Conflict, and Coworker Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.423	.291	4.891	-	<.001	[.849, 1.997]
	Work-Life Conflict	.523	.084	6.186	.422	<.001	[.356, .689]
2	Constant	1.546	.282	5.488	-	<.001	[.990, 2.102]
	Work-Life Conflict	1.238	.201	6.167	.998	<.001	[.841, 1.634]
	WLCxCoworkerSS**	-.248	.064	-3.896	-.631	<.001	[-.374, -.123]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Overall Work-Life Conflict*Coworker Social Support

Work Interfering with Life Conflict: Nonwork Social Support Moderation Analysis

Since correlational analyses revealed work interfering with life (WIL) to be significantly related to all three of the burnout dimensions while life interfering with work (LIW) was not significantly related to two of the three burnout dimensions (emotional exhaustion and cynicism), additional moderation analyses were added to test whether the different types of social support moderate the relationship between WIL and each of the three burnout dimensions. These analyses retested Hypotheses 3, 3a, and 3b with WIL rather than overall WLC. Hypothesis 3 tested whether nonwork social support moderated the relationship between overall WLC and each of the three burnout dimensions. The additional analyses replaced WLC with WIL and found a difference in the results when considering cynicism. The analysis with emotional exhaustion (EE) found Model 1, R^2=.038, F(1, 177)=7.016, p=.009 and Model 2, R^2=.063, F(2, 176)=5.944, p=.003 to be significant, with Model 2 adding significant variability explained (R^2 Change=.025, p=.031). The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 14. Results

indicated that greater WIL was associated with greater EE (*B*=.125, *SE*=.047, β=.195, *p*=.009) and the interaction between WIL and nonwork social support was significant (*B*=-.035, *SE*=.016, β=-.322, *p*=.031), suggesting that the effect of WIL on EE depended on the level of nonwork social support. The negative beta indicated that the moderator of nonwork social support weakened the relationship between WIL and EE.

Table 14

Regression: Emotional Exhaustion, Work Interfering with Life Conflict, and Nonwork Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.866	.199	9.375	-	<.001	[1.473, 2.259]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.125	.047	2.649	.195	.009	[.032, .218]
2	Constant	1.901	.198	9.618	-	<.001	[1.511, 2.291]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.304	.095	3.211	.475	.002	[.117, .491]
	WILxNonworkSS**	-.035	.016	-2.174	-.322	.031	[-.066, -.003]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Work Interfering with Life Conflict*Nonwork Social Support

The analysis with reduced personal accomplishment (RPA) found Model 1, R^2=.230, F(1, 177)=96.628, p=<.001 and Model 2, R^2=.242, F(2, 176)=28.074, p<.001 to be significant, although Model 2 did not add significant variability explained (R^2 Change=.011, p=.105). The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 15. Results indicated that greater WIL was associated with greater RPA (*B*=.446, *SE*=.061, β=.480, *p*<.001) and the interaction between

WIL and nonwork social support was not significant (*B*=-.034, *SE*=.021, β=-.217, *p*=.105), suggesting that the effect of WIL on RPA did not depend on the level of nonwork social support.

Table 15

Regression: Reduced Personal Accomplishment, Work Interfering with Life Conflict, and Nonwork Social Support

Model		B	SE	t	β	p	%CI*
1	Constant	1.374	.258	5.323	-	<.001	[.865, 1.883]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.446	.061	7.280	.480	<.001	[.325, .567]
2	Constant	1.408	.258	5.463	-	<.001	[.899, 1.917]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.621	.124	5.025	.669	<.001	[.377, .865]
	WILxNonworkSS**	-.034	.021	-1.631	-.217	.105	[-.075, .007]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Work Interfering with Life Conflict*Nonwork Social Support

The analysis with cynicism (CYN) found Model 1, R^2=.227, F(1, 177)=51.892, p<.001 and Model 2, R^2=.243, F(2, 176)=28.254, p<.001 to be significant, although Model 2 did not add significant variability explained (R^2 Change=.016, p=.053). The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 16. Results indicated that greater work interfering with life conflict (WIL) was associated with greater CYN (*B*=.283, *SE*=.039, β=.476, *p*<.001) and the interaction between WIL and nonwork social support was not significant (*B*=-.026, *SE*=.013, β=-.259, *p*=.053), suggesting that the effect of WIL on CYN did not depend on the level of nonwork social support.

This finding contrasts the earlier finding where nonwork social support moderated the relationship between overall WLC and cynicism.

Table 16

Regression: Cynicism, Work Interfering with Life Conflict, and Nonwork Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.348	.165	8.159	-	<.001	[1.022, 1.675]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.283	.039	7.204	.476	<.001	[.205, .360]
2	Constant	1.375	.165	8.355	-	<.001	[1.050, 1.699]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.416	.079	5.276	.702	<.001	[.261, .572]
	WILxNonworkSS**	-.026	.013	-1.949	-.259	.053	[-.052, .000]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Work Interfering with Life Conflict*Nonwork Social Support

Work Interfering with Life Conflict: Supervisor Support Moderation Analysis

Hypothesis 3a tested whether work-related social support, specifically supervisor support, would moderate the relationship between overall work-life conflict (WLC) and the three burnout dimensions. When retesting Hypothesis 3a using work interfering with life (WIL) conflict instead of overall WLC, results were similar as before. When considering emotional exhaustion (EE), Model 1, R^2=.038, F(1, 177)=7.016, p=.009 and Model 2, R^2=.115, F(2, 176)=11.393, p=<.001 were both significant, and Model 2 (R^2 Change=.076, p<.001) added significant variability explained. The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 17. Results indicated that greater WIL was associated with greater EE (B=.125, SE=.047, β=.195, p=.009)

and the interaction between WIL and supervisor social support was significant (*B*=-.111, *SE*=.028, β=-.521, *p*<.001), suggesting that the effect of WIL on EE depended on the level of supervisor social support. The negative beta indicated that the moderator of supervisor social support weakened the relationship between WIL and EE.

Table 17

Regression: Emotional Exhaustion, Work Interfering with Life Conflict, and Supervisor Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.866	.199	9.375	-	<.001	[1.473, 2.259]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.125	.047	2.649	.195	.009	[.032, .218]
2	Constant	2.063	.198	10.416	-	<.001	[1.672, 2.454]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.408	.086	4.766	.637	<.001	[.239, .577]
	WILxSupervisorSS**	-.111	.028	-3.900	-.521	<.001	[-.167, -.055]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Work Interfering with Life Conflict*Supervisor Social Support

When considering cynicism (CYN), Model 1, R^2=.227, F(1, 177)=51.892, p<.001 and Model 2, R^2=.284, F(2, 176)=34.864, p<.001 was significant, and Model 2 (R^2 Change=.057, p<.001) added significant variability explained. The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 18. Results indicated that greater WIL was associated with greater CYN (*B*=.283, *SE*=.039, β=.476, *p*<.001) and the interaction between WIL and supervisor social support was significant (*B*=-.089, *SE*=.024, β=-.450, *p*<.001), suggesting that the effect of WIL on CYN

depended on the level of supervisor social support. The negative beta indicated that the moderator of supervisor social support weakened the relationship between WIL and CYN.

Table 18

Regression: Cynicism, Work Interfering with Life Conflict, and Supervisor Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.348	.165	8.159	-	<.001	[1.022, 1.675]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.283	.039	7.204	.476	<.001	[.205, .360]
2	Constant	1.506	.165	9.129	-	<.001	[1.180, 1.831]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.509	.071	7.134	.858	<.001	[.368, .650]
	WILxSupervisorSS**	-.089	.024	-3.744	-.450	<.001	[-.135, -.042]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Work Interfering with Life Conflict*Supervisor Social Support

When considering reduced personal accomplishment (RPA), Model 1, R^2=.230, F(1, 177)=52.993, p<.001 and Model 2, R^2=.258, F(2, 176)=30.548, i<.001 were significant, and Model 2 (R^2 Change=.027, p=.012) added significant variability explained. The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 19. Results indicated that greater WIL was associated with greater RPA (B=.446, SE=.061, β=.480, p<.001) and the interaction between WIL and supervisor social support was significant (B=-.096, SE=.038, β=-.311, p=.012), suggesting that the effect of WIL on RPA depended on the level of supervisor social support. The negative beta indicated that the moderator of supervisor social support weakened the relationship between WIL and RPA.

Table 19

Regression: Reduced Personal Accomplishment, Work Interfering with Life Conflict, and Supervisor Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.374	.258	5.323	-	<.001	[.865, 1.883]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.446	.061	7.280	.480	<.001	[.325, .567]
2	Constant	1.544	.263	5.874	-	<.001	[1.026, 2.063]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.691	.114	6.077	.744	<.001	[.467, .915]
	WILxSupervisorSS**	-.096	.038	-2.543	-.311	.012	[-.170, -.021]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Work Interfering with Life Conflict*Supervisor Social Support

Work Interfering with Life Conflict: Coworker Support Moderation Analysis

Hypothesis 3b tested whether work-related social support, specifically coworker support, would moderate the relationship between overall WLC and the three burnout dimensions. When retesting Hypothesis 3a using work interfering with life (WIL) conflict instead of overall WLC, results were similar as before. When considering emotional exhaustion, Model 1, R^2=.038, F(1, 177)=7.016, p=.009 and Model 2, R^2=.117, F(2, 176)=11.663, p<.001 were both significant, and Model 2 (R^2 Change=.079, p<.001) added significant variability explained. The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 20. Results indicated that greater WIL was associated with greater EE (B=.125, SE=.047, β=.195, p=.009) and the interaction between WIL and coworker social support was significant (B=-.145, SE=.036, β=-.711 p<.001), suggesting that the effect of

WIL on EE depended on the level of coworker social support. The negative beta indicated that the moderator of coworker social support weakened the relationship between WIL and EE.

Table 20

Regression: Emotional Exhaustion, Work Interfering with Life Conflict, and Coworker Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.866	.199	9.375	-	<.001	[1.473, 2.259]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.125	.047	2.649	.195	.009	[.032, .218]
2	Constant	1.943	.192	10.108	-	<.001	[1.564, 2.322]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.543	.115	4.732	.848	<.001	[.317, .770]
	WILxCoworkerSS**	-.145	.036	-3.966	-.711	<.001	[-.217, -.073]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Work Interfering with Life Conflict*Coworker Social Support

When considering cynicism (CYN), Model 1, R^2=.227, F(1,177)=51.892, p<.001 and Model 2, R^2=.265, F(2, 176)=31.796, p<.001 was significant, and Model 2 (R^2 Change=.039, p=.003) added significant variability explained. The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 21. Results indicated that greater work interfering with life (WIL) conflict was associated with greater CYN (B=.283, SE=.039, β=.476, p<.001) and the interaction between WIL and coworker social support was significant (B=-.094, SE=.031, β=-.498 p=.003), suggesting that the effect of WIL on CYN depended on the level of coworker social support. The negative beta indicated that the moderator of coworker social support weakened the relationship between WIL and CYN.

Table 21

Regression: Cynicism, Work Interfering with Life Conflict, and Coworker Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.348	.165	8.159	-	<.001	[1.022, 1.675]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.283	.039	7.204	.476	<.001	[.205, .360]
2	Constant	1.399	.162	8.613	-	<.001	[1.078, 1.719]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.554	.097	5.710	.933	<.001	[.362, .745]
	WILxCoworkerSS**	-.094	.031	-3.045	-.498	.003	[-.155, -.033]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Work Interfering with Life Conflict* Coworker Social Support

When considering reduced personal accomplishment (RPA), Model 1, R^2=.230, $F(1,177)$=52.993, p<.001 and Model 2, R^2=.281, $F(2,176)$=34.425, p<.001 were significant, and Model 2 (R^2 Change=.051, p<.001) added significant variability explained. The coefficients for these models can be found in Table 22. Results indicated that greater WIL was associated with greater RPA (B=.446, SE=.061, β=.480, p<.001) and the interaction between WIL and coworker social support was significant (B=-.168, SE=.048, β=-.570, p<.001), suggesting that the effect of WIL on RPA depended on the level of coworker social support. The negative beta indicated that the moderator of coworker social support weakened the relationship between WIL and RPA.

Table 22

Regression: Reduced Personal Accomplishment, Work Interfering with Life Conflict, and Coworker Social Support

Model		*B*	*SE*	*t*	β	*p*	*%CI**
1	Constant	1.374	.258	5.323	-	<.001	[.865, 1.883]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.446	.061	7.280	.480	<.001	[.325, .567]
2	Constant	1.464	.251	5.821	-	<.001	[.968, 1.960]
	Work Interfering with Life Conflict	.933	.150	6.207	1.004	<.001	[.636, 1.229]
	WILxCoworkerSS**	-.168	.048	-3.526	-.570	<.001	[-.262, -.074]

*Confidence interval at 95%

**Interaction term: Work Interfering with Life Conflict* Coworker Social Support

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

This study sought to investigate the relationship between work-life conflict (WLC) and the dimensions of burnout. In this study, both directions of WLC were considered including life interfering with work conflict (LIW) and work interfering with life conflict (WIL). The study was also interested in how different types of social support may moderate the relationship between WLC and each of the dimensions of burnout including emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced personal accomplishment.

Hypothesis 1 was supported by finding that there were positive significant correlations between WLC and emotional exhaustion, WLC and cynicism, and WLC and reduced personal accomplishment. This tells us that WLC has significant positive correlations with each of the burnout dimensions. Hypothesis 1a was interested in whether LIW would be correlated with each of the burnout dimensions. Hypothesis 1a was partially supported, as LIW had a significant positive relationship with reduced personal accomplishment, but not for emotional exhaustion or cynicism. The reason that LIW is only related to reduced personal accomplishment may be since LIW directly affects one's ability to perform at work, whereas emotional exhaustion and cynicism are more related to intrinsic demands. Life interfering with work may lead to losing the sense of effectiveness, which is a primary symptom of reduced personal accomplishment. Hypothesis 1b was supported due to WIL having a significant positive correlation with each of the three burnout dimensions. These results suggest that LIW may not be related to the dimensions of burnout as expected, since only reduced personal accomplishment was found to be related to LIW, while all three dimensions were found to be related to WIL. This suggests that combining LIW and WIL into an overall WLC score may obscure true relationships, which

supports previous literature (Carlson et al., 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Netemeyer et al., 1996).

While previous research has found both WIL and LIW to be significant predictors of burnout (Brauchli et al., 2011), this study partially supported that finding since all three dimensions were significantly related to WIL and one dimension was related to LIW. Additionally, previous research suggests emotional exhaustion should be the highest correlation of the three dimensions (Koeske & Koeske, 1989), although the present study found the emotional exhaustion correlations with WLC and WIL to be smaller in our sample compared to cynicism and reduced personal accomplishment. This is an interesting finding as these results show support for the idea that all three dimensions play an important role in defining burnout, where others argued cynicism and reduced personal accomplishment are unnecessary (Shirom, 1989).

Hypothesis 2, 2a, and 2b hypothesized relationships between different types of social support (work: supervisor, work: coworker, nonwork) and each dimension of burnout. All three of these hypotheses were supported. Hypothesis 2 was supported by finding a significant negative relationship between supervisor support and each of the three burnout dimensions. Hypotheses 2a was supported by finding a significant negative relationship between coworker support and the three burnout dimensions. Similarly, Hypothesis 2b was supported by finding a significant negative relationship between nonwork social support and the burnout dimensions. These supported hypotheses suggest having any type of social support, whether it be from coworkers, supervisors, or people outside of work, will be related to having lower levels of the burnout dimensions and is consistent with previous literature (Tang & Li, 2021; Burke & Greenglass, 1995; Carr et al., 1996; Greenglass et al., 1997). This is also consistent with the conservation of resources theory which states that social support is a resource that serves to

replenish lost resources; therefore, those who have a form of social support are related to experiencing fewer negative effects from work or nonwork stressors, leading to a lower chance of experiencing burnout symptoms.

Hypotheses 3, 3a, and 3b aim to build on the notion that social support may serve as a buffer between WLC and the burnout dimensions. The stress buffering model states that social support serves as a protective barrier to reduce the strength of the relationship between stressors and strain (Carlson & Perrewé, 1991). Hypotheses 3, 3a, and 3b hypothesized that different types of social support would moderate the relationship between overall WLC and each of the three burnout dimensions. Hypothesis 3 states that social support from nonwork sources would moderate the relationship between overall WLC and each of the three burnout dimensions. This was partially supported, as we found that adding the moderating term (nonwork social support) significantly increased variability explained for emotional exhaustion and cynicism, but not reduced personal accomplishment. This tells us that we gain additional predictive ability with the relationship between WLC and emotional exhaustion and WLC and cynicism by adding nonwork social support as a moderator, but not between WLC and reduced personal accomplishment.

Hypothesis 3a states that social support from a supervisor would moderate the relationship between overall WLC and the three burnout dimensions. This was fully supported as we found social support from a supervisor moderating the relationship between WLC and each of the three burnout dimensions. We found similar results when considering social support from coworkers. Hypothesis 3b stated that social support from coworkers would moderate the relationship between WLC and each of the three burnout dimensions, and this was supported. These findings are consistent with previous literature that shows support for the buffering effect

of social support against burnout (Burke & Greenglass, 1995; Carr et al., 1996; Greenglass et al., 1997).

Additional analyses were conducted due to the correlational finding that WIL shares more relation to the dimensions of burnout compared to LIW. Hypothesis 3, 3a, and 3b were retested using WIL in place of overall WLC. Primary analyses found nonwork social support to moderate the relationship between overall WLC and each of the three burnout dimensions, while the additional analysis found that nonwork social support moderated the relationship between WIL and emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment, but not cynicism. This finding is unexpected and may tell us that nonwork social support may not have a buffering effect on cynicism, although generalizability of this finding should be made with caution. The results of this study adds to existing literature to aid in determining true relationships between WLC, burnout, and social support.

Limitations & Future Research

The present study contributes valuable insights into the relationship between work-life conflict (WLC), burnout dimensions, and the moderating role of social support. However, there are limitations to the study that should be addressed. First, the cross-sectional design of the study limits our ability to infer causality. Future studies should consider a longitudinal design to establish causality and reduce lagged effects. Second, the sample was comprised of predominately white/Caucasian females (67% and 63% respectively), and since 61% of the sample noted they did not have any children at home, this may play a role in the lower incidence of LIW compared to WIL. The limited diversity may restrict the ability to generalize our findings to more diverse populations. Future research should aim for a more heterogeneous sample to increase external validity of results. Third, the use of a self-report measure may introduce

response biases such as the social desirability bias. Although the reliability of the scales was high (Cronbach's alpha ranging from .91 to .95), objective measures or data from multiple sources would help to reduce biased responses. Additionally, although the study focused on three different types of social support, there are numerous other sources that may need to be accounted for. Future studies could consider a broader sense of organizational support, or looking at the nonwork social support sources separately, since this study combined all nonwork social support sources (friends, family, significant other). Finally, future studies may consider an intervention approach to assess the efficacy of programs such as supervisor/coworker training, organizational policy changes, or social support group opportunities.

Conclusion

This study explored the intricate relationship between work-life conflict (WLC), burnout, and the role of social support in mitigating these adverse effects. Through comprehensive analysis, it has been demonstrated that WLC significantly contributes to burnout, manifesting in emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced personal accomplishment. In this study, there were more significant relationships with work interfering with life (WIL) and the burnout dimensions as compared to and life interfering with work (LIW). These findings highlight the dual-directional nature of WLC, where both WIL and LIW differentially impacts burnout levels among employees.

The research also highlights the importance of social support as a buffering mechanism against the negative impacts of WLC and burnout. We found each type of social support to be significantly negatively related to each of the three burnout dimensions. Additionally, nonwork social support was a moderator between overall WLC and emotional exhaustion and cynicism, but not reduced personal accomplishment. Supervisor support and coworker support was

supported as a moderator between overall WLC and all three burnout dimensions. When considering WIL rather than overall WLC, moderation analyses remained the same except for nonwork social support and cynicism, where nonwork social support did not moderate the relationship. Supervisor and coworker support within the workplace, as well as family and friends outside the work environment, play pivotal roles in alleviating the stress associated with WLC. These support systems enhance employees' resilience by providing resources, thereby reducing the likelihood of experiencing burnout.

REFERENCES

Ahola, K. (2007). Occupational burnout and health. *People and Work Research Reports 81.* Finnish Institute of Occupational Health.

Allen, T. D., & Armstrong, J. (2006). Further examination of the link between work-family conflict and physical health: The role of health-related behaviors. *American Behavioral Scientist, 49*(9), 1204–1221. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764206286386

Alvaro, C., Lyons, R. F., Warner, G., Hobfoll, S. E., Martens, P. J., Labonté, R., & Brown, R. E. (2010). Conservation of resources theory and research use in health systems. *Implementation Science, 5*(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-5-79

Baruch-Feldman, C., Brondolo, E., Ben-Dayan, D., & Schwartz, J. (2002). Sources of social support and burnout, job satisfaction, and productivity. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 7*(1), 84–93. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.7.1.84

Beutell, N. J. (2010). Health, supervisory support, and workplace culture in relation to work-family conflict and synergy. *Psychological Reports, 107*(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.2466/01.17.21.PR0.107.4.3-14

Brandes, P., Castro, S. L., James, M. S. L., Martinez, A. D., Matherly, T. A., Ferris, G. R., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2008). The interactive effects of job insecurity and organizational cynicism on work effort following a layoff. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 14*(3), 233–247. https://doi.org/10.1177/1071791907311967

Brauchli, R., Bauer, G. F., & Hämmig, O. (2011). Relationship between time-based work-life conflict and burnout: A cross-sectional study among employees in four large Swiss enterprises. *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 70*(3), 165–174. https://doi.org/10.1024/1421-0185/a000052

Brewer, E. W., & Shapard, L. (2004). Employee burnout: A meta-analysis of the relationship between age or years of experience. *Human Resource Development Review, 3*(2), 102–123. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484304263335

Brunner, E. (1997). Stress and the biology of inequality. *BMJ (Clinical Research Ed.), 314*, 1472–1476.

Burke, R. J., & Greenglass, E. (1993). Work stress, role conflict, social support, and psychological burnout among teachers. *Psychological Reports, 73*(2), 371–380. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1993.73.2.371

Burke, R. J., & Greenglass, E. (1996). Work stress, social support, psychological burnout and emotional and physical well-being among teachers. *Psychology, Health & Medicine, 1*(2), 193–205. https://doi.org/10.1080/13548509608400018

Burke, R. J., & Greenglass, E. R. (1995). A longitudinal examination of the cherniss model of psychological burnout. *Social Science Medicine, 40*(10), 1357-1363.

Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56*(2), 249–276. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1999.1713

Carlson, D. S., & Perrewé, P. L. (1991). The role of social support in the stressor-strain relationship: An examination of work-family conflict. *Journal of Management, 25*(4), 513-540.

Carr, A., Roseingrave, P., & Fitzgerald, M. X. (1996). Factors associated with stress responses in staff caring for patients with cystic fibrosis. *Irish Journal of Psychology, 17*(3), 241–250. https://doi.org/10.1080/3033910.1996.10558105

Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 98*(2), 310-357.

Cooper, C. L., & Quick, J. C. (2017). *The handbook of stress and health: A guide to research and practice.* John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.

Demerouti, E., Sanz-Vergel, A. I., Petrou, P., & Van Den Heuvel, M. (2016). How work-self conflict/facilitation influences exhaustion and task performance: A three-wave study on the role of personal resources. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 21*(4), 391–402. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000022

Donders, N. C. G. M., Roskes, K., & van der Gulden, J. W. J. (2007). Fatigue, emotional exhaustion and perceived health complaints associated with work-related characteristics in employees with and without chronic diseases. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health, 80*(7), 577–587. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-006-0168-6

Elbaz, S., Richards, J. B., & Provost Savard, Y. (2023). Teleworking and work–life balance during the COVID-19 pandemic: A scoping review. *Canadian Psychology, 64*(4), 227–258. https://doi.org/10.1037/cap0000330

Ferguson, M., Carlson, D., Boswell, W., Whitten, D., Butts, M. M., & Kacmar, K. M. (Micki). (2016). Tethered to work: A family systems approach linking mobile device use to turnover intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 101*(4), 520–534. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000075

Frone, M. R. (2000). Work-family conflict and employee psychiatric disorders: The national comorbidity survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(6), 888–895. https://doi.org/10.I037//0021-90I0.85.6.888

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*(1), 143-162.

Gisler, S., Omansky, R., Alenick, P. R., Tumminia, A. M., Eatough, E. M., & Johnson, R. C. (2018). Work-life conflict and employee health: A review. *Journal of Applied Biobehavioral Research, 23*(4), 1-46. Bellwether Publishing, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1111/jabr.12157

Gore, S. (1987). Perspectives on social support and research on stress moderating processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 8*(2), 85–102. https://doi.org/10.1300/J075v08n02_06

Greenglass, E. R., & Burke, R. J. (1990). Burnout over time. *Journal of Health and Human Resources Administration, 13*(2), 192-204.

Greenglass, E. R., Burke, R. J., & Konarski, R. (1997). The impact of social support on the development of burnout in teachers: Examination of a model. *Work and Stress, 11*(3), 267–278. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678379708256840

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *The Academy of Management Review, 10*(1), 76-88. https://doi.org/10.2307/258214

Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2006). Sources of social support and burnout: A meta-analytic test of the conservation of resources model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(5), 1134–1145. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1134

Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Buckley, M. R. (2004). Burnout in organizational life. *Journal of Management, 30*(6), 859–879. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2004.06.004

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*(3), 513–524. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513

Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50*(3), 337–370. https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00062

House, J. S. (1981). *Work stress and social support.* Addison-Wesley.

Huynh, J. Y., Winefield, A. H., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2013). Social support moderates the impact of demands on burnout and organizational connectedness: A two-wave study of volunteer firefighters. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 18*(1), 9–15. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030804

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity.* John Wiley.

Khamisa, N., Peltzer, K., & Oldenburg, B. (2013). Burnout in relation to specific contributing factors and health outcomes among nurses: A systematic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 10*(6), 2214-2240. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph10062214

Koeske, G. F., & Koeske, R. D. (1989). Construct validity of the Maslach burnout inventory: A critical review and reconceptualization. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 25*, 131–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886389252004

Koniarek, J., & Dudek, B. (1996). Social support as a buffer in the stress–burnout relationship. *International Journal of Stress Management, 3*(2), 99–106. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01857718

Kshtriya, S., Kobezak, H. M., Popok, P., Lawrence, J., & Lowe, S. R. (2020). Social support as a mediator of occupational stressors and mental health outcomes in first responders. *Journal of Community Psychology, 48*(7), 2252–2263. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22403

Ladd, D., & Henry, R.A. (2000). Helping coworkers and helping the organization: The role of support perceptions, exchange ideology, and conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*(10), 2028-2049.

Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(2), 123-133.

Lewis, S., & Cooper, C. L. (1999). The work-family research agenda in changing contexts. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*(4), 392–393.

Lockwood, N. R. (2003). *Work/life balance challenges and solutions.* SHRM Research Quarterly.

Maslach, C., Jackson, S., & Leiter, M. (1997). The Maslach burnout inventory manual. *Evaluating Stress: A Book of Resources, 3,* 191-218.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(3), 498–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.3.498

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 397–422. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397

Maslach, C., & Zimbardo, P. G. (1982). *Burnout: The cost of caring*. Prentice-Hall, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1176/ps.34.7.650

Melamed, S., Shirom, A., Toker, S., & Shapira, I. (2006). Burnout and risk of type 2 diabetes: A prospective study of apparently healthy employed persons. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 68*(6), 863–869. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.psy.0000242860.24009.f0

Minnotte, K. L. (2012). Perceived discrimination and work-to-life conflict among workers in the United States. *Sociological Quarterly, 53*(2), 188–210. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2012.01231.x

Minnotte, K. L., Gravelle, M., & Minnotte, M. C. (2013). Workplace characteristics, work-to-life conflict, and psychological distress among medical workers. *Social Science Journal, 50*(4), 408–417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2013.08.001

Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(4), 400–410. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.400

Nichols, H. M., & Swanberg, J. E. (2018). Measuring work–life conflict among low-wage workers. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research, 9*(3), 473–497. https://doi.org/10.1086/697254

Parasuraman, S., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2002). Toward reducing some critical gaps in work-family research. *Human Resource Management Review, 12*, 299–312.

Prapanjaroensin, A., Patrician, P. A., & Vance, D. E. (2017). Conservation of resources theory in nurse burnout and patient safety. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 73*(11), 2558–2565. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13348

Quittner, A. L., Glueckauf, R. L., & Jackson, D. N. (1990). Chronic parenting stress: Moderating versus mediating effects of social support. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*(6), 1266–1278. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1266

Reichl, C., Leiter, M. P., & Spinath, F. M. (2014). Work–nonwork conflict and burnout: A meta-analysis. *Human Relations, 67*(8), 979–1005. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713509857

Schaufeli, W. B., & Greenglass, E. R. (2001). Introduction to special issue on burnout and health. *Psychology & Health, 16*(5), 501–510. https://doi.org/10.1080/08870440108405523

Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2009). Burnout: 35 years of research and practice. *Career Development International, 14*(3), 204–220. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430910966406

Seiger, C. P., & Wiese, B. S. (2009). Social support from work and family domains as an antecedent or moderator of work-family conflicts? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75*(1), 26–37. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.03.001

Shirom, A. (1989). Burnout in work organizations. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 25–48. John Wiley & Sons.

Shoji, K., Cieslak, R., Smoktunowicz, E., Rogala, A., Benight, C. C., & Luszczynska, A. (2016). Associations between job burnout and self-efficacy: A meta-analysis. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping, 29*(4), 367-386. https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2015.1058369

Song, X., Li, H., Jiang, N., Song, W., Ding, N., & Wen, D. (2021). The mediating role of social support in the relationship between physician burnout and professionalism behaviors. *Patient Education and Counseling, 104*(12), 3059–3065. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2021.04.025

Sun, J., Wang, X., Wang, Y., Du, X., & Zhang, C. (2019). The mediating effect of perceived social support on the relationship between mindfulness and burnout in special education teachers. *Journal of Community Psychology, 47*(7), 1799–1809. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22229

Sungu, L. J., Weng, Q. & Kitule, J. A. (2019). When organizational support yields both performance and satisfaction: The role of performance ability in the lens of social exchange theory. *Personnel Review, 48*(6), 1410–1428. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-10-2018-0402

Tang, X., & Li, X. (2021). Role stress, burnout, and workplace support among newly recruited social workers. *Research on Social Work Practice, 31*(5), 529–540. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731520984534

Toker, S., Melamed, S., Berliner, S., Zeltser, D., & Shapira, I. (2012). Burnout and risk of coronary heart disease. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 74*(8), 840–847. https://doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0b013e31826c3174

Toker, S., Shirom, A., Shapira, I., Berliner, S., & Melamed, S. (2005). The association between burnout, depression, anxiety, and inflammation biomarkers: C-reactive protein and fibrinogen in men and women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*(4), 344-362. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.344

Wu, F., Ren, Z., Wang, Q., He, M., Xiong, W., Ma, G., Fan, X., Guo, X., Liu, H., & Zhang, X. (2021). The relationship between job stress and job burnout: The mediating effects of perceived social support and job satisfaction. *Psychology, Health and Medicine, 26*(2), 204–211. https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2020.1778750

Zhang, Y., Duffy, J. F., & De Castillero, E. R. (2017). Do sleep disturbances mediate the association between work-family conflict and depressive symptoms among nurses? A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing, 24*(8), 620–628. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpm.12409

Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 52*(1), 30–41.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Descriptive Statistics of Sample

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Gender		
Female	112	63%
Male	65	36%
Non-binary	2	1%
Duration in Current Position		
1 to 2 years	34	19%
2 to 5 years	62	35%
6 months to 1 year	15	8%
More than 5 years	68	38%
Race/Ethnicity		
Asian / Pacific Islander	15	8%
Black or African American	27	15%
Hispanic	11	6%
Multiple ethnicity / Other	6	3%
White / Caucasian	120	67%
Industry		
Consulting	4	2%
Education	36	20%
Finance (includes real estate)	10	6%
Healthcare (includes social work/mental health)	26	15%

Hospitality	7	4%
Human Resources	5	3%
Non-Profit	8	4%
Other	40	22%
Public (government)	13	7%
Technology	22	12%
Trade	7	4%
Travel	1	1%
Job Role Type		
Administrative Staff	22	12%
Consultant	3	2%
Junior Management	25	14%
Middle Management	26	15%
Other	6	3%
Skilled Laborer	16	9%
Trained Professional	64	36%
Upper Management	17	9%
Children At Home		
No	110	61%
Yes	67	37%
Prefer not to say	2	1%

Appendix B: IRB Approval Letter

Office of Research Compliance
2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd.
Sam H. Ingram Bldg (ING) Room 010A
Box 124
Murfreesboro, TN 37132
www.mtsu.edu/irb

Date: May 23, 2024
PI: Madison Perry
Department: Middle Tennessee State University, Psychology
Re: Initial - IRB-FY2024-140
Work-Life Conflict, Burnout, and the Role of Social Support

The Middle Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board has rendered the decision below for the above referenced study.

Decision: Exempt
Category: Category 2.(i). Research that only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior (including visual or auditory recording) if at least one of the following criteria is met:
The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects;

Findings:
Research Notes:

Please note that even though your proposed study is deemed exempt from further IRB review, the following apply to your approved study:

1. In accordance with 45 CFR 46.110, expiration dates do not apply to research eligible for Exempt Review under the Common Rule, and continuing review is not required by the IRB.
2. Any unanticipated harm to participants or adverse events must be reported to the Office of Compliance.
3. All modifications to the approved study must be submitted for review through Cayuse IRB for approval before their implementation. Adding new researchers constitutes a modification to the protocol. Per MTSU Policy, a researcher is defined as anyone who handles the data or interacts with participants. Everyone meeting this definition for this project must have completed the required CITI training and received IRB approval prior to becoming actively involved in the project.
4. Closure of the study must be submitted within Cayuse when the study ends or when personal identifiers are removed from the data and all codes and keys are destroyed.

5. All research materials must be retained by the PI for at least three (3) years after study completion and then destroyed in a manner that maintains confidentiality and anonymity.

Sincerely,

The Middle Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board

Appendix C: Work-Family Conflict Scale

(Netemeyer et al., 1996)

Original Items

1. The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life.
2. The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities.
3. Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me.
4. My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties.
5. Due to work-related duties, I have to make changes to my plans for family activities.

Revised Items

1. The demands of my work interfere with my home and personal life.
2. The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill nonwork or personal duties.
3. Things I want to do outside of work do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me.
4. My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill nonwork or personal duties.
5. Due to work-related duties, I must make changes to my plans for nonwork activities.

Response Options: 7-point Likert Scale

1: Strongly Disagree; 2: Disagree; 3: Somewhat Disagree; 4: Neutral; 5: Somewhat Agree; 6: Agree; 7: Strongly Agree

Appendix D: Family-Work Conflict Scale

(Netemeyer et al., 1996)

Original Items

1. The demands of my family or spouse / partner interfere with work-related activities.
2. I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home.
3. Things I want to do at work don't get done because of the demands of my family or spouse/partner.
4. My home life interferes with my responsibilities at work such as getting to work on time, accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime.
5. Family-related strain interferes with my ability to perform job-related duties.

Revised Items

1. The demands of my personal life interfere with work-related activities.
2. I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time outside of work.
3. Things I want to do at work don't get done because of the demands of my personal life.
4. My personal life interferes with my responsibilities at work such as getting to work on time, accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime.
5. Strain from my personal life interferes with my ability to perform job-related duties.

Response Options: 7-point Likert Scale

1: Strongly Disagree; 2: Disagree; 3: Somewhat Disagree; 4: Neutral; 5: Somewhat Agree; 6: Agree; 7: Strongly Agree

Appendix E: Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support

(Zimet et al., 1988)

1. *There is a special person who is around when I am in need.
2. *There is a special person with whom I can share my joys and sorrows.
3. **My family really tries to help me.
4. **I get the emotional help and support I need from my family.
5. *I have a special person who is a real source of comfort to me.
6. ***My friends really try to help me.
7. ***I can count on my friends when things go wrong.
8. **I can talk about my problems with my family.
9. ***I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows.
10. *There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings.
11. **My family is willing to help me make decisions.
12. ***I can talk about my problems with my friends.

Response Options: 7-point Likert Scale

1: Strongly Disagree; 2: Disagree; 3: Somewhat Disagree; 4: Neutral; 5: Somewhat Agree; 6: Agree; 7: Strongly Agree

*Significant other

**Family

***Friends

Appendix F: Supervisor Support Scale

(Beutell, 2010; Minnotte, 2012)

1. My supervisor supports me when I have a work problem.
2. I feel comfortable brining up family and personal matters with my supervisor.
3. My supervisor keeps me informed of things I need to do my job well.
4. My supervisor has realistic expectations of my job performance.
5. My supervisor recognizes when I do a good job.
6. My supervisor is fair when responding to employee personal/family needs.
7. My supervisor accommodates me when I have family/personal business.
8. My supervisor is understanding when I have family/personal business.
9. My supervisor cares about effects of work on personal/family life.

Response Options: 4-point Likert Scale

1: Strongly Disagree; 2: Disagree; 3: Agree; 4: Strongly Agree

*Original scale was reversed from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree

Appendix G: Perceived Coworker Support Scale

(Ladd & Henry, 2000)

1. My coworkers are supportive of my goals and values.
2. Help is available from my coworkers when **I** have a problem.
3. My coworkers really care about my well-being.
4. My coworkers are willing to offer assistance to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.
5. *Even if I did the best job possible, my coworkers would fail to notice.
6. My coworkers care about my general satisfaction at work.
7. *My coworkers show very little concern for me.
8. My coworkers care about my opinions.
9. My coworkers are complimentary of my accomplishments at work.
10. **My coworkers are understanding when I have family/personal business.

Response Options: 4-point Likert Scale

1: Strongly Disagree; 2: Disagree; 3: Agree; 4: Strongly Agree (Original response options not noted in original article)

*Reverse scored

** Additional item, adapted from the Supervisor Support Scale (Beutell, 2010; Minnotte, 2012)

Appendix H: The Maslach Burnout Inventory

(Maslach et al., 1997)

MBI - General Survey - MBI-GS:

Sample Statements:

1. I feel emotionally drained from my work.
2. In my opinion, I am good at my job.
3. I doubt the significance of my work.

Copyright ©1996 Wilmar B. Schaufeli, Michael P. Leiter, Christina Maslach & Susan E. Jackson. All rights reserved in all media. Published by Mind Garden, Inc., www.mindgarden.com