



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Employee corporate social responsibility and well-being: the role of work, family and culture spillover*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/208184/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Bolt, E.E.T. [orcid.org/0000-0002-2516-0153](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2516-0153) and Homer, S.T. (2024) Employee corporate social responsibility and well-being: the role of work, family and culture spillover. *Employee Relations*. ISSN 0142-5455

<https://doi.org/10.1108/er-02-2023-0097>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

# EMPLOYEE CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND WELL-BEING: THE ROLE OF WORK, FAMILY, AND CULTURE SPILLOVER

## ABSTRACT

**Purpose:** Considering the conservation of resources theory, this research investigates the mediating roles of work, family and culture on the relationship between employee CSR and employee well-being.

**Design/methodology/approach** Self-administered questionnaire data from 403 employees working across multiple organisations in the United Kingdom were analysed using path analysis with SmartPLS.

**Findings** Organisations can only maximally benefit from their CSR investment when specific HR strategies are in place, as no direct relationship between CSR and well-being outcomes was observed. Family-to-work spillover and work-family culture were significant mediators in the relationship between employee CSR and well-being.

**Research limitation/implications** CSR strategies targeted at improving employee well-being do not necessarily do so in a direct approach. They, therefore, may not serve the desired performance outcomes of organisations. Boundary conditions of applying the crossover model of COR theory were observed.

**Originality/value** This research contributes to the limited knowledge of the effectiveness of employee-related CSR strategies on HRM and well-being outcomes from an employees' perspective. Employee-related CSR strategies are unlikely to improve employee well-being if the interindividual level of analysis, i.e. interchange between work, family, and culture, is not considered.

**Keywords** Employee-related CSR, employee well-being, work-family spillover, COR

## 1. Introduction

Businesses are transitioning through substantial turbulence, among these labour shortages and strikes, pandemics, and political tensions. Derived through these challenges, organisations face the intricate task of harmonising the interests of various stakeholders. One stakeholder group particularly affected by the challenges are employees—the focus of this study. Employee contributions to organisations exhibit a dual nature, they not only contribute to organisational performance but also incentivise organisations to engage in socially responsible behaviour for the greater societal benefit by virtue of their bargaining power (Donaghey *et al.*, 2022). The challenges businesses are facing require more than government intervention alone; the active involvement of businesses and their employees in formulating and executing strategies to

address these issues is imperative, underscoring the essential importance of employee well-being (Guest, 2017).

Research argues that the benefits of CSR to employees have severely been understudied (Hsieh *et al.*, 2022; Homer and Gill, 2022), arguably due to a focus in research on the impact of traditional CSR—organisations satisfying financial stakeholders. Such research typically emphasises corporate financial growth as an outcome of CSR (Wang *et al.*, 2016). While macro-level perspectives are valuable, it is employees who experience and deliver CSR strategies. Therefore, an organisation is more likely to experience desired workplace outcomes of CSR strategies, such as positive employee attitudes and behaviours at work, when such strategies align with employee life values and priorities (Singhapakdi *et al.*, 2015). Therefore, more recent CSR literature highlights the importance of designing CSR strategies specific to employees (Haski-Leventhal, 2022) and includes employees in the core meaning of CSR, defining CSR as a “connection between the firm’s socially responsible identity and behaviour and employees’ identity and behaviour (Haski-Leventhal *et al.*, 2017, p. 184).

The few studies on the impact of CSR on well-being hint at a favourable impact. Kim *et al.* (2018) found evidence of an indirect positive influence of philanthropic and economic CSR to employee quality of life through quality of work life. Ahmed *et al.* (2020) found a significant direct effect between CSR and employee well-being and a significant mediating effect of employee well-being between CSR and employee green behaviour. Elorza *et al.* (2022) analysed the effect of employee-perceived high-involvement work practices (HIWP) to employee well-being, proxied as job satisfaction and positive and negative affect, in the SME context. They found a significant positive effect of HIWP to job satisfaction and positive affect, and a significant negative effect on negative affect. While these results are promising, the findings either represent non-Western perspectives or apply to specific business contexts (SMEs). Also, the CSR dimensions investigated in these studies were not specifically tailored as employee-CSR strategies and well-being was measured as proxies using job satisfaction and affect (Elorza *et al.*, 2022) and overall quality in life (Kim *et al.*, 2018) instead of employee well-being related to overall health. Taken together, these aspects represent several gaps, also previously mentioned in the review of Frynas and Yamahaki (2016), which this research aims to address.

This research examines the relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), Human Resource Management (HRM) and employee well-being (Voegtlin and Greenwood,

2013). HRM involves managing employees within extensive networks influenced by public and private actors and stakeholders at the micro and macro levels (Voegtlin and Greenwood, 2013). This study assesses the micro-level impact by examining the influence of CSR on an employees' family domain and vice versa, as well as the presence of a work-family culture, and the subsequent influence on employee well-being. Following the well-being classifications of Van De Voorde *et al.* (2012), this study considers health well-being—the psychological and mental well-being of an employee—included in this research as general mental well-being (Heun *et al.*, 1999) and lifestyle and habits (Dinzeo *et al.*, 2014). Lifestyle and habits as a parallel outcome to employee well-being is considered as lifestyle and habits are not necessarily direct precedents of employee well-being due to their complex causation, potential mediating roles, measurement challenges, and varying relevance across individuals.

Taking the theoretical position of the conservation of resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989) and specifically considering resource gain and loss, this research considers several HRM practices as mediating variables between ECSR and employee well-being. The first aspects considered in this research are work-family spillover (WFS) and family-work spillover (FWS), and the second aspect is the presence of a work-family culture (WFC). WFS is the degree to which experiences from work are transferred into and affect the quality of the family domain (Kim, 2017), while FWS is the influence family has on the work domain (Carlson *et al.*, 2019). WFC comprises “mutual assumptions, beliefs, and values on whether an organisation supports and values the interchange of employees' work and family” (Thompson *et al.*, 1999, p. 394). While there is ongoing debate as to what practices form part of HRM due to a ‘plurality of understandings’ (Voegtlin and Greenwood, 2016, p. 182), we believe these aspects are part of HRM. First, these practices are concerned with employees, i.e., the ‘independent agents’ (p. 6) in the organisation and acknowledge that these independent agents have responsibilities and interests to the organisation and ‘out-of-work activities’ (p. 7), such as family responsibilities (Boxall and Purcell, 2022). Balancing family responsibilities with work is one of the key issues in contemporary HRM (Boxall and Purcell, 2022).

Taken together, this research aims to assess the relationship between Employee CSR (ECSR) strategies and well-being, and considers HRM aspects as mediating variables, while taking COR theory as the explaining mechanism, thereby making an important contribution to the CSR, HR and well-being literature. Two research questions guide this research: **do CSR strategies targeted at employees directly influence employee well-being? Second, do WFS, FWS, and FWC mediate this relationship?**

## **2. Literature review and hypothesis development**

### *2.1 Conservation of resources theory and crossover model*

COR theory's central premise is that human beings "strive to obtain, retain, foster, and protect those things they centrally value" (Hobfoll, 2018, p.104), and work and family are indicated as centrally valued resources to people. This study adopts the reasoning of the extended crossover model (Bolger *et al.*, 1989) which emphasises the possibility of transmission of people's states and resources to explain the relationship between valued resources and well-being outcomes. Crossover entails an interpersonal process that occurs when the experiences of one individual, such as strain or excitement, affect the experiences of another individual in the same social environment, e.g., their family members (Hobfoll, 2018). While the extended crossover model only discussed the transmission of negative states (Bolger *et al.*, 1989), Westman (2001) proposed that positive experiences and states can also be transmitted between individuals. Hence, we propose that the crossover process in this study follows a direct crossover path in which positive experiences are transmitted between employees and their families.

We anticipate that ECSR strategies provide employees with valued resources to cope with specific work challenges, such as WFS, FWS and WFC. For instance, employees struggling to balance their work and family responsibilities, such as caring for ageing or underage dependents, can benefit from ECSR strategies such as flexible work arrangements or childcare support. Similarly, Employee Assistance Programs, offering mental health support, can prove invaluable for employees facing work-related stressors that affect their family life. Fostering a supportive family-friendly work culture can aid employees in managing the tensions between their family and work responsibilities. Following the reasoning of the crossover model, we propose that when the employee values resources, they can transmit these resources positively to their family through crossover and spillover, in return transmitting to their well-being.

### *2.2 ECSR*

Schulze *et al.* (2018) identify four CSR aspects: employee-related CSR, environmental CSR, philanthropy, and customer-related CSR. This study focuses on ECSR, denoting organizational practices aimed at enhancing employees' physiological and psychological well-being (Hawn and Ionnou, 2016). ECSR is important as how employees interpret and construct judgements

surrounding their organisation's CSR affects work attitudes and behaviours (Kim *et al.*, 2020). ECSR is perceived by employees through the organisation's signals with which employees feel proud of their association and membership (Lewin *et al.*, 2020).

### *2.3 ECSR and employee well-being*

Employee well-being is a core research subject given its impact on an organisation's competitive advantage and performance (Kowalski and Loretto, 2017). Previous research found several organisational factors that positively influence employee well-being, such as high-involvement work systems (Cafferkey *et al.*, 2019). While much research has been conducted on job attitudes conflated with well-being, such as turnover (Bolt *et al.*, 2022), an employee's lifestyle and habits as forms of well-being have generally been neglected in research. ECSR is an integral aspect of one's work, and while well-being encompasses an individual's overall health, research indicates that a healthy lifestyle has a positive impact on an individual's overall life satisfaction (Kvintova *et al.*, 2016). Both elements are widely recognized as valuable resources in the context of human well-being (Hobfoll, 1989). Previous research found a positive relationship between CSR strategies targeted at the employee and employee behaviours reflecting well-being, such as employee performance and helping behaviour (Shen and Benson, 2016), and employee life satisfaction (Zhang and Tu, 2016). An employee's lifestyle and habits should be considered a dependent variable, where an employee's lifestyle and habits could spillover into other domains, such as personal life satisfaction (Ampofo *et al.*, 2017), off-the-job embeddedness and leisure experience (Deng and Gao, 2017). From these arguments, the following hypotheses are derived:

*H1a* There is a significant positive relationship between ECSR and well-being.

*H1b* There is a significant positive relationship between ECSR and lifestyle and habits.

### *2.4 ECSR and positive WFS, positive FWS and FWC*

Work and family life domains influence one another so that they can complement or detract from each other (Cho and Tay, 2016). In this research, the expansionist hypothesis is followed (Barnett and Hyde, 2001) by focusing on positive spillover, meaning that the advantages of having multiple roles outweigh the disadvantages (Greenhaus and Powell, 2006). This research

examines positive spillover in both directions of work and family, suggesting that positive experiences at work could positively influence family life.

Numerous factors contribute to positive WFS, including empowering leadership (Kim and Beehr, 2022) and working conditions (Lawson *et al.*, 2013). This study concentrates on the impact of ECSR. ECSR allows employees to enhance their work by gaining CSR skills that can be applied in their personal and family lives through behavioural transfer (Hanson *et al.*, 2006). This reasoning aligns with the crossover model of COR theory, suggesting that people strive to retain, protect and build resources. ECSR offers employees a sense of meaning and fulfilment beyond work, potentially boosting job satisfaction, pride, and overall work satisfaction when employees believe their efforts benefit society or the environment. This heightened happiness and job satisfaction can, in turn, enhance family connections and the home environment through the spillover effect. Accordingly, the following hypothesis is proposed:

*H2a* There is a significant positive relationship between ECSR and positive WFS.

Some CSR activities are family-oriented, such as voluntary salary-based charitable contributions and salary-based payments for childcare. Such involvement can improve family life, mitigating the effects of family stress on work. Therefore, we propose:

*H2b* There is a significant positive relationship between ECSR and FWS.

WFC may benefit from ECSR involvement. CSR-friendly companies value employees as human beings with their own values and responsibilities outside work, such as family. Thus, CSR-engaged employees may view their company as more supportive of their family and work-life balance. Therefore, it is hypothesized:

*H2c* There is a significant positive relationship between ECSR and WFC.

### *2.5 WFS to employee well-being and lifestyle and habits*

Family-friendly HRM helps employees manage their work and family demands and is commonly implemented to ensure viability (Agarwala *et al.*, 2020). It is argued that the existence of formal policies alone, such as written CSR and HR policies, does not necessarily lead to an improved family-friendly climate (Brummelhuis and Lippe, 2010). Therefore, it is crucial to consider the informal practices and intangible spillover role of the family on work.

In practice, the spillover effect means that aspects affecting an employee's family life, such as a bad mood, can influence their work behaviour.

Research shows that WFS and FWS significantly relate to employee life satisfaction and career goals (Kim, 2017). Research investigating the effect of positive WFS found several positive effects, such as reduced burnout (Innstrand *et al.*, 2008) and improved work engagement and satisfaction with marriage (Hakanen *et al.*, 2011). Therefore, following the expansionist hypothesis and crossover model propositions, we expect that positive WFS and FWS positively relate to employee well-being, lifestyle and habits.

*H3a* There is a significant positive relationship between positive WFS and well-being.

*H3b* There is a significant positive relationship between positive WFS and lifestyle and habits.

#### *2.6 FWS to employee well-being and lifestyle and habits*

FWS is “a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect” (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985, p. 77) and entails employees ‘bringing home’ aspects of the family to work (Carlson *et al.*, 2019). Positive family experiences or emotions could spill over into the work domain, enhancing an individual's work-related attitudes and behaviours. Consider a scenario where an individual enjoys a nurturing and supportive family environment. In such cases, the positive emotions, contentment, and emotional support experienced within the family sphere could seamlessly spill over into their work. In line with this, we hypothesise:

*H4a* There is a significant positive relationship between FWS and well-being.

*H4b* There is a significant positive relationship between FWS and lifestyle and habits.

#### *2.7 WFC to employee well-being and lifestyle and habits*

A WFC emerges informally as a result of the work-family practices adopted by an organization. Research (Heikkinen *et al.*, 2021) suggests that these practices embody socially responsible HRM, indicating the extent to which organizations assume responsibility for employee well-being. This involves recognising the instrumental value of employees to organizations while



also addressing their personal and social expectations, such as the need to create a culture in which employees can integrate work and family life to support their overall well-being (Heikkinen *et al.*, 2021). Therefore, a WFC signifies the organization's commitment to providing employees with a sustainable working and family life. WFC consists of managerial support, organisational time, and perceived negative career consequences (Agarwala *et al.*, 2020). The existence of an informal WFC has reduced conflicts arising from competing work and family pressures and enhanced employee commitment (Chang *et al.*, 2014). In organisations with an informal WFC, family demands do not hinder an employee's work. Subsequently, employees are more likely to demonstrate positive workplace attitudes, such as commitment and career expectations (Chang *et al.*, 2014). Following this, we hypothesise:

*H5a* There is a significant positive relationship between WFC and well-being.

*H5b* There is a significant positive relationship between WFC and lifestyle and habits.

## 2.8 Mediating effects

Besides the direct relationships between CSR and employee outcomes, Bhattacharya *et al.* (2011) argue that CSR programs must fulfil key stakeholder needs to trigger favourable reactions. Such needs can be achieved by implementing strategies to help CSR optimise employee outcomes. For example, Du *et al.* (2008) investigated the link between CSR and customer loyalty, finding that functional and psychosocial benefits provided to customers help to optimise customer loyalty. We propose a mediating effect that implies the impact of ECSR on well-being and lifestyle and habits is not direct but occurs through the mediating variables of positive WFS, positive FWS, and WFC. For positive WFS, we postulate that if employees are engaged in CSR activities at work and have positive experiences there, it may spill over into their family life, enhancing their overall well-being and lifestyle and habits. Conversely, for FWS, positive experiences or support in the family domain can improve an employee's well-being, lifestyle and habits. These mediating effects have been tested by Goodman *et al.* (2009) but in the context of negative WFS mediating the relationship between maternal work stress and depressive symptoms. For FWS, a mediating effect of negative FWS has been found to exist between family hassles and job resources and employees flourishing at work in the afternoon (Du *et al.*, 2018).

For WFC, it is argued that theories of institutional and organisational culture may be complementary due to their multiple points of connection (Zilber, 2012). WFC has been assessed as an antecedent (Mauno *et al.*, 2005; Perrigino *et al.*, 2019) as well as a moderator (Marescaux *et al.*, 2020) in numerous studies. The complementary nature of cultural theories may allow WFC to adopt a dynamic position. Therefore, by taking the expansionist hypothesis and similar to previous research (Goñi *et al.*, 2021), we argue a mediating effect of WFC exists between ECSR and well-being outcomes because ECSR practices encourage employees to undertake voluntary activities that align with employees' desires and are also concerned with adequate work-life balance. Subsequent positive experiences of ECSR could spill over to their family as work and family responsibilities are managed more effectively, elevating both employee well-being and lifestyle and habits. More specifically, an organization that promotes a positive WFC can enhance employee well-being and lifestyle and habits by supporting employees in managing their work and family responsibilities effectively, as is done through ECSR. Hence, we hypothesise:

*H6* There is a significant mediating effect of positive WFS (*H6a*), FWS (*H6b*), and WFC (*H6c*) between ECSR and well-being.

*H7* There is a significant mediating effect of positive WFS (*H7a*), FWS (*H7b*), and WFC (*H7c*) between ECSR and lifestyle and habits.

[Insert Figure 1]

### **3. Methodology**

This section describes the sample employed in the research, data collection process, measures adopted in the survey and model, and the different analyses performed to test the hypotheses.

#### *3.1 Sample and data collection process*

This study is interested in employees' perceptions of the proposed variables in the model. A survey was conducted among 403 full-time working adults in the UK. The UK was considered a relevant context with its long history of valuing the well-being of employees in organizations (CIPD, 2023). Also, the UK government advocates businesses to practice CSR and demonstrate involvement in these (UK Government, 2018). Respondents were accessed using the third-party survey distributor, Prolific, a data collection platform becoming increasingly popular in

the academic business literature (Talwar *et al.*, 2021; Yousaf *et al.*, 2022). To ensure the target audience was reached, pre-screening criteria were set to UK citizens, married and in full time employment. The survey was sent to a total of 3,069 potential respondents. 419 completed surveys were received and 16 were excluded for reasons including incompleteness. The average completion time was just over 7 minutes, with a maximum of just over 45 minutes. Respondents represented private companies (N=241), government (N=79), institutions (N=35), state-owned companies (N=28), charities (N=7) and other sectors (N=13). Most respondents were male, held undergraduate degrees, and had two children. Most respondents did not hold a managerial role in the organization, had an average organizational tenure of 10.4 years and earned £2555 per month on average. Table 1 shows the demographic and employment characteristics of the respondents.

[Insert Table 1 here]

### 3.2 Measures

Employees were surveyed online using a questionnaire consisting of 57 questions. The items included in the questionnaire were adapted from previous research and all items were measured on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from "I strongly disagree (1) to "I strongly agree" (7).

*3.2.1 Employee-related CSR.* Schulze *et al.* (2018) construct was adopted and consisted of 6 items. An example item was "My organization encourages its employees to participate in voluntary activities". The Cronbach alpha value was 0.88.

*3.2.2 Positive Work-to-family spillover.* Hanson *et al.* (2006) construct was adopted and consisted of three aspects: positive affective spillover (4 items), behaviour-based spillover (4 items), and value-based spillover (3 items). An example item was: "When things are going well at work, my outlook regarding my family life is improved". The Cronbach alpha value was 0.94.

*3.2.3 Positive Family-to-work spillover.* This variable was adopted from Hanson *et al.* (2006) and consisted of 11 items. An example item for positive affective spillover was "When things are going well in my family life, my outlook regarding my job is improved". An example item for behaviour-based instrumental positive spillover was "skills developed in my family life help me in my job". An example of an item belonging to value-based instrumental positive

spillover was "I apply the principles my family values in work situations". The Cronbach alpha value was 0.96.

*3.2.4 Work-family culture.* This construct was adopted from Thompson *et al.* (1999), consisting of 11 items. An example item is "In general, managers in this organization are quite accommodating of family-related needs". The Cronbach alpha value was 0.95.

*3.2.5 Employee well-being.* The 5-item WHO-5 Well-being Index (Heun *et al.*, 1999) was used to measure employee well-being. The Cronbach alpha value was 0.93. Examples of items included "I have felt cheerful and in good spirits" and "I have felt active and vigorous".

*3.2.6 Employee lifestyle and habits.* A shortened version of the Dinzeo *et al.* (2014) questionnaire was used to measure employee lifestyle and habits. This study focused on integrating two dimensions, psychological health and health and exercise, as they were considered most closely aligned with the concept of well-being within this study. The multidimensional scale assesses employee perceptions of the degree to which they maintain good health and exercise (6 items) and psychological health (7 items). The Cronbach alpha value was 0.92.

### *3.3 Data analysis*

The proposed research model has been tested using structural equation models using the default mode of Partial Least Squares (PLS-SEM). This research is based on a composite measurement model comprising a reflective (Mode A) approach. SmartPLS 3.2.8 software has been used (Ringle *et al.*, 2015). The latent model approach was employed to test the relationships between the different model constructs. The mediation effect of work-family spillover, family-work spillover, and family culture on the relationship between ECSR and employee well-being, lifestyle and habits has been tested using the recommendations of Hair *et al.* (2016).

## **4. Results**

### *4.1 Measurement Model*

All constructs were evaluated in mode A (reflective constructs). Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics. Hair *et al.* (2016) proposed indicator individual reliability, latent variable internal consistency, construct convergent validity and latent variables' discriminant validity as essential elements for evaluation. Table 3 presents the first three elements with indicator

reliability following the criterion of outer loadings being above 0.69 (Hair *et al.*, 2016). Two items were removed for loadings below 0.500 (work-family culture question 11 and employee lifestyle and habits question 6). Whilst other items loaded below 0.69, these were retained as loadings above 0.600 can be acceptable within exploratory analyses (Hulland, 1999). Construct reliability was evaluated using the composite reliability index and additionally the rho\_A construct reliability. All constructs in the model meet the minimum requirement of Cronbach alpha above 0.600 and composite reliability higher than 0.7 (Nunnally, 1978). Table 3 demonstrates that all the latent variables confirm their convergent validity, with their Average Variance Extracted (AVE) being above the minimum of 0.5.

[Insert Table 2 here]

[Insert Table 3 here]

Tables 4 and 5 show the information necessary to determine the discriminant validity of the reflective constructs of the model (Mode A latent variables). The Fornell-Larcker criterion and the Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio (HTMT) indicate their discriminant validity since all the values fall below 0.85 (Kline, 2011).

[Insert Table 4 here]

[Insert Table 5 here]

Since the data of this study was cross-sectional, there is a vulnerability to common method bias (CMB) within the data that could impact the study's results (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003). This CMB could incorrectly represent any associations between the measured variables (Conway and Lance, 2010). Hence, the study conducted Hartman's single-factor analysis for CMB, wherein the total variance should be less than 50%. Table 6 shows only the components with Eigenvalues above one from a total of 57 components; the highest variance reported by a single factor was 35.425; therefore, CMB issues did not surface.

[Insert Table 6 here]

#### 4.2 Structural model

The inexistence of collinearity between model constructs has been confirmed by calculating the VIF values between the model constructs. Values ranged from a minimum of 1.000 to a maximum of 2.406 and thus are below the cut-off criterion of 5 proposed by Hair *et al.* (2016). Following this, the model's path coefficients' size, sign and significance were calculated using  $R^2$  values. Table 7 presents the path coefficient values (direct effects), the t-statistic and the corresponding confidence intervals, as well as the  $R^2$  values. The confidence intervals and the t-statistics were obtained using bootstrapping with 5,000 samples.

[Insert Table 7 here]

Bootstrapping was conducted using the SmartPLS 3 using 5,000 subsamples based upon percentile bootstrapping with a two-tailed test type and a significance level of 0.05. These results can be seen in Table 8 with significant P values in bold. Four of the eleven paths were insignificant.

[Insert Table 8 here]

To test for the mediating effects of positive WFS, positive FWS and WFC, the specific indirect effects from the bootstrapping were evaluated as seen in Table 9. Of the six indirect effects, four were significant, in bold. Results indicate an indirect-only full mediation between positive FWS and WFC, and positive WFS had no mediating effect.

[Insert Table 9 here]

#### 5. Discussion

This research investigated the role of ECSR as a determinant of positive WFS, positive FWS, and WFC and the mediating role of positive WFS and FWS, and WFC on well-being and lifestyle and habits. Concerning the first research question, whether ECSR strategies directly and positively influence employee well-being, the results indicate that ECSR strategies do not directly influence employee well-being, lifestyle and habits. These findings suggest that organisations must have intervening strategies in place for ECSR to affect well-being,

presenting an important nuance to the debate on the importance of ECSR strategies in achieving well-being outcomes (Haski-leventhal, 2022).

Regarding the second research question, whether WFS, FWS, and FWC mediate the relationship between ECSR and well-being outcomes, our analysis demonstrates that only FWS and FWC were significant mediators. While previous research found several positive effects of WFS on individual outcomes (Hakanen *et al.*, 2011; Innstrand *et al.*, 2008), the findings of this study suggest that such benefits are not universal. Furthermore, these findings challenge Cho and Tay's (2016) suggestions that workplace experiences transfer into the family domain. Our research found that family experiences can spill over to work, corroborating the suggestions of Carlson *et al.*, (2018) that employees do bring aspects of family experiences to work.

For WFC, and similar to Chang *et al.*, (2014) who found improved commitment of working mothers as a result of an informal WFC, we found that an informal WFC plays a significant and important role in improving employee well-being. So, organizations aiming to achieve the benefits of ECSR strategies could benefit from developing a strong presence of an informal WFC to achieve such benefits. Altogether, these findings introduce new understandings and refine the relationship between ECSR and employee well-being. Furthermore, our study contributes to the diversity in types of well-being (Van De Voorde *et al.*, 2012) by having considered two types of health well-being—overall well-being and lifestyle and habits—of which the latter has rarely been taken as a well-being variable in the CSR, HRM and well-being literature.

### *5.1 Theoretical contributions*

The findings indicate mediating effects of FWS and WFC between the relationship of ECSR strategies and well-being outcomes. These findings show the utility of COR theory and the crossover model in understanding the relationship between ECSR and well-being. ECSR did have an indirect positive effect on employee well-being through positive FWS. This finding confirms the propositions of COR theory's crossover model that it is possible for positive family experiences to spill over to work. However, the findings demonstrate that the reverse is invalid, there was no significant mediating effect of WFS. Restating Hobfoll (2018, p. 104), "COR theory is a motivation theory that explains much of human behaviour based on the evolutionary need to acquire and conserve resources for survival", our findings demonstrate

that employees do transfer aspects from their family to their work, but not the other way around. This could indicate an invisible barrier where employees are hesitant to bring work aspects to the family to keep these resources secure, distanced and separated. The family is seemingly a higher valued resource than work resources for human survival. The fact that WFS did not have a significant mediating role also presents a necessary boundary condition of the generalizability of COR theory. Our research contributes to an enhanced understanding of how COR theory and the crossover model interact with CSR, HRM, and well-being variables. The application of COR theory and the crossover model also contribute to more theoretical diversity in the CSR literature (Frynas and Yamahaki, 2016). More importantly, the findings indicate an important boundary condition for generalising in this context.

### *5.2 Practical implications*

This study found no direct relationship between ECSR and employee well-being. This leads us to conclude that managers have to pay attention to the role of intervening strategies, in our study the presence of a positive FWS and WFC. Therefore, CSR initiatives targeted at families should be implemented. Examples of such strategies include flexible working hours, locations and days, leave policies for parental leave and dependent care leave, family health insurance policies, and monetary budgets for employees with caring responsibilities. Having such policies can lead to more affective and behavioural spillover from employees towards the company, while simultaneously improving lifestyle, habits, and well-being, which in return translates into improved organisational performance. Organisations must take the lead in bringing business and society back together by focusing on the connections between societal and economic progress (Haski-Leventhal, 2022). The findings of this study would support this; by encouraging family dynamics as a societal benefit, the organisation can also realise economic progress in return.

### *5.3 Limitations and suggestions for further research*

There is potential for moderators to influence the relationships in the model, specifically related to the insignificant mediating effect observed in this study on WFS. Such moderators could include, occupation, identity traits, gender, age, socio-economic status and family support. Actual perceptions of family members were not considered in this research due to accessibility restrictions, so we encourage future research to include family members' perceptions to



understand better how work influences family life. The study was conducted in the UK, so it has a spatial limitation as the results only represent a single country. A cross-country analysis is recommended to test whether the findings of this study are comparable to other countries. The study included individuals from several different industries and while this contributes to the generalisability of the findings, an industry tailored approach to investigating CSR strategies would result in recommendations to a specific industry. Also, although this study included two variables to measure employee well-being but well-being is a multidimensional concept (Van De Voorde *et al.*, 2012). Hence, future research should investigate other aspects of well-being and could potentially evaluate other constructs of the Lifestyle and Habits questionnaire (Dinzeo *et al.*, 2014), such as including psychological well-being, social well-being, and financial well-being.

## **6. Conclusion**

Businesses are increasingly implementing CSR strategies in response to the UN Sustainable Development Goals. This research found that ECSR is only effective when positive FWS and WFC are present. ECSR strategies were also found to have a spillover effect on work, family, and culture, indicating that such strategies could positively influence other aspects beyond work life. Therefore, if organisations present the right set of resources to employees, implementing ECSR strategies will benefit organisations and individuals.

## **7. References**

- Agarwala, T., Arizkuren, A., Del Castillo, E. and Muñiz, M. (2020), "Work-family culture and organisational commitment: A multidimensional cross-national study", *Personnel Review*, Vol. 49 No. 7, pp. 1467-1486.
- Ahmed, M., Zehou, S., Raza, S.A., Qureshi, M.A. and Yousufi, S.Q. (2020), "Impact of CSR and environmental triggers on employee green behavior: The mediating effect of employee well-being", *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, Vol. 27 No. 5, pp. 2225-2239.
- Ampofo, E.T., Coetzer, A., and Poisat, P. (2017), "Relationships between job embeddedness and employees' life satisfaction", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 39 No. 7, pp. 951-966.

- Bhattacharya, C.B., Sen, S. and Korschun, D. (2011), *Leveraging corporate responsibility: The stakeholder route to maximising business and social value*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Barnett, R.C. and Hyde, J.S. (2001), “Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist theory”, *American Psychologist*, Vol. 56 No. 10, pp. 781-796.
- Bolger, N., DeLongis, A., Kessler, R.C. and Wethington, E., (1989), “The contagion of stress across multiple roles”, *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 51 No. 1, pp. 175-183.
- Bolt, E.E.T., Winterton, J. and Cafferkey, K. (2022), “A century of labour turnover research: A systematic literature review”, *The International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 555-576.
- Boxall, P. and Purcell, J. (2022), *Strategy and Human Resource Management*, Bloomsbury Publishing, New York, NY.
- Brummelhuis, L. and Lippe, T. (2010), “Effective work-life balance support for various household structures”, *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 49 No. 2, pp. 173-193.
- Cafferkey, K., Heffernan, M., Harney, B., Dundon, T. and Townsend, K., (2019), “Perceptions of HRM system strength and affective commitment: the role of human relations and internal process climate”, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 30 No. 21, pp. 3026-3048.
- Carlson, D.W., Kacmar, K.M., Thompson, M.J. and Andrews, M.C. (2019), “Looking good and doing good: family to work spillover through impression management”, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 31-45.
- Chang, E., Chin, H. and Ye, J. (2014), “Organisational work-family culture and working mothers' affective commitment: How career expectations matter”, *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 53 No. 5, pp. 683-700.
- Cho, E. and Tay, L. (2016), “Domain satisfaction as a mediator of the relationship between work-family spillover and subjective well-being: A longitudinal study”, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 445-457.
- CIPD (2023), “Wellbeing at work”, available at: <https://www.cipd.org/uk/knowledge/factsheets/well-being-factsheet/> (accessed 5 December 2023).

- Conway, J.M. and Lance, C.E. (2010), "What reviewers should expect from authors regarding common method bias in organizational research", *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 325-334.
- Deng, S. and Gao, J. (2017), "The mediating roles of work-family conflict and facilitation in the relations between leisure experience and job/life satisfaction among employees in Shanghai banking industry", *Journal of Happiness Studies*, Vol. 18 No. 6, pp. 1641-1657.
- Dinzeo, T.J., Thayasivam, U. and Sledjeski, E.M. (2014), "The development of the lifestyle and habits questionnaire-brief version: Relationship to quality of life and stress in college students", *Prevention Science*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 103-114.
- Du, D., Derks, D. and Bakker, A.B. (2018), "Daily spillover from family to work: A test of the work-home resources model", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 237-247.
- Du, S., Sen, S. and Bhattacharya, C.B. (2008), "Exploring the social and business returns of a corporate oral health initiative aimed at disadvantaged Hispanic families", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 35 No. 3, pp. 483-494.
- Donaghey, J., Cullinane, N., Dundon, T., Dobbins, T. and Hickland, E. (2022), "Employee choice of voice and non-union worker representation", *Industrial Relations Journal*, Vol. 53 No. 6, pp. 503-522.
- Elorza, U., Garmendia, A., Kilroy, S., Van De Voorde, K. and Van Beurden, J. (2022), "The effect of high involvement work systems on organisational performance and employee well-being in a Spanish industrial context", *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 32. No. 4, pp. 782-798.
- Espasandín-Bustelo, F., Ganaza-Vargas, J. and Diaz-Carrion, R. (2021), "Employee happiness and corporate social responsibility: the role of organisational culture", *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, Vol. 43 No. 3, pp. 609-629.
- Frynas, J.G. and Yamahaki, C. (2016), "Corporate social responsibility: Review and roadmap of theoretical perspectives", *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 258-285.
- Goñi, S., Corredor, P. and León, C. (2021), "Work-family policies and the transformation triangle: women, organizational culture and managerial strategy", *Gender in Management*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 241-256.

- Goodman, W.B., Crouter, A.C. and The Family Life Project Key Investigators (2009), “Longitudinal associations between maternal work stress, negative work-family spillover, and depressive symptoms”, *Family Relations: An interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, Vol. 58 No. 3, pp. 245-258.
- Greenhaus, J.H. and Beutell, N.J. (1985), “Sources of conflict between work and family roles”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 76-88.
- Greenhaus, J.H. and Powell, G.N. (2006), “When work and family are allies: a theory of work-family enrichment”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 72-92.
- Guest, D. (2017), “Human resource management and employee well-being: toward a new analytic framework”, *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 22-28.
- Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C. and Sarstedt, M. (2016), *A primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*, Sage publications, New York, USA.
- Hakanen, J.J., Peeters, M.C.W. and Perhoniemi, R. (2011), “Enrichment processes and gain spirals at work and at home: A 3-year cross-lagged panel study”, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 84 No. 1, pp. 8-30.
- Hanson, G.C., Hammer, L.B. and Colton, C.L. (2006), “Development and validation of a multidimensional scale of perceived work-family positive spillover”, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 249-265.
- Haski-Leventhal, D. (2022), *Strategic corporate social responsibility*, Sage Publications: London, UK.
- Haski-Leventhal, D., Roza, L. and Meijs, L.C. (2017), “Congruence in corporate social responsibility: Connecting the identity and behavior of employers and employees”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 143 No. 1, pp. 35-51.
- Hawn, O. and Ioannou, I. (2016), “Mind the gap: the interplay between external and internal actions in the case of corporate social responsibility”, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 37 No. 13, pp. 2569-2588.
- Heikkinen, S., Lämsä, A-M. and Niemistö, C. (2021), “Work-family practices and complexity of their usage: A discourse analysis towards socially responsible human resource management”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 171 No. 4, 815-831.

- Heun, R. Burkart, M., Maier, W. and Bech, P. (1999), "Internal and external validity of the WHO well-being scale in the elderly general population", *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, Vol. 99 No. 3, pp. 171-178.
- Hobfoll, S.E. (1989), "Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualising stress", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 44 No. 3, pp. 513-524.
- Hobfoll, S.E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J-P., and Westman, M. (2018), "Conservation of resources in the organisational context: The reality of resources and their consequences", *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 103-128.
- Homer, S.T. and Gill, C.M.H.D. (2022), "How corporate social responsibility is described in keywords: an analysis of 144 CSR definitions across seven decades", *Global Business Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09721509221101141>
- Hsieh, Y-C., Weng, J., Pham, N.T. and Yi, L-H. (2022), "What drives employees to participate in corporate social responsibility? A personal characteristics – CSR capacity – organisational reinforcing model of employees' motivation for voluntary CSR activities", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 33 No. 18, pp. 3703-3735.
- Hulland, J. (1999), "Use of partial least squares (PLS) in strategic management research: a review of four studies", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 195-204.
- Innstrand, S.T., Langballe, E.M., Espnes, G.A., Falkum, E. and Aasland, O.G. (2008), "Positive and negative work-family interaction and burnout: A longitudinal study of reciprocal relations", *An international journal of Work, Health & Organisations*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 1-15.
- Kim, H. (2017), "Investigating the effects of work-family spillovers, gender, and formal mentoring on career goal of managers", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 38 No. 8, pp. 1065-1085.
- Kim, H.(L.), Woo, E., Uysal, M. and Kwon, N. (2018), "The effects of corporate social responsibility (CSR) on employee well-being in the hospitality industry", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 1584-1600.
- Kim, M. and Beehr, T.A. (2022), "Can reflection explain how empowering leadership affects spillover to family life? let me think about it", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 430-458.

- Kim, J., Milliman, J. and Lucas, A. (2020), "Effects of CSR on employee retention via identification and quality-of-work-life", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 1163-1179.
- Kline, R.B. (2011), "Convergence of structural equation modeling and multilevel modeling" Williams, M and Vogt, W.P. (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Innovation in Social Research Methods*, Sage Publications Ltd.
- Kowalski, T.H.P. and Loretto, W. (2017), "Well-being and HRM in the changing workplace", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 28 No. 16, pp. 2229-2255.
- Kvintova, J., Kudlacek, M. and Sigmundova, D. (2016), "Active lifestyle as a determinant of life satisfaction among university students", *Anthropologist*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 179-185.
- Lawson, K.M., Davis, K.D., Crouter, A.C, and O'Neill, J.W. (2013), "Understanding work-family spillover in hotel managers", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 273-281.
- Lewin, L.D., Warren, D.E. and AlSuwaidi, M. (2020), "Does CSR make better citizens? The influence of employee CSR programs on employee societal citizenship behavior outside of work", *Business and Society Review*, Vol. 125 No. 3, pp. 271-288.
- Marescaux, E., Rofcanin, Y., Las Heras, M., Ilies, R. and Bosch, M.J. (2020), "When employees and supervisors (do not) see eye to eye on family supportive supervisor behaviours: The role of segmentation desire and work-family culture", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 121 No. 4, 103471.
- Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U., and Pykkö, M. (2005), "Does work-family conflict mediate the relationship between work-family culture and self-reported distress? Evidence from Finnish organizations", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 78 No. 4, pp. 509-530.
- Nunnally, J.D. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Perrigino, M.B., Dunford, B.B., Troup, M., Boss, R.W. and Boss, D.S. (2019), "Work-family culture within hospitals: An interdepartmental analysis of employee engagement and retention", *Health Care Management Review*, Vol. 44 No. 4, pp. 296-305.

- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J.Y. and Podsakoff, N.P. (2003), “Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 5, pp. 879-903.
- Porter, M.E., and Kramer, M.R. (2011). “Creating Shared Value: How to reinvent capitalism and unleash a wave of innovation and growth”, *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 62-77.
- Ringle, C.M., Wende, S. and Becker, J.M. (2015), “SmartPLS 3. Hamburg: SmartPLS”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 9, pp. 419-445.
- Schulze, D., Heinitz, K. and Lorenz, T. (2018), “Comparative organisational research starts with sound measurement: Validity and invariance of Turker's corporate social responsibility scale in five cross-cultural samples”, *PLoS One*, doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0207331
- Shen, J. and Benson, J. (2016), “When CSR is a social norm: how socially responsible human resource management affects employee work behavior”, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 42 No. 6, pp. 1723-1746.
- Singhapakdi, A., Lee, D.-J., Sirgy, M.J. and Senasu, K. (2015), “The impact of incongruity between an organisation's CSR orientation and its employees' CSR orientation on employees' quality of work life”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 68 No. 1, pp. 60-66.
- Talwar, S., Dhir, A., Scuotto, V. and Kuar, P. (2021), “Barriers and paradoxical recommendation behaviour in online to offline (O2O) services. A convergent mixed-method study”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 131 No. 3, pp. 25-29.
- Thompson, C.A., Beauvais, L.L. and Lyness, K.S. (1999), “When work-family benefits are not enough: the influence of WFC on benefit utilisation, organisational attachment, and work-family conflict”, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 54 No. 3, pp. 392-415.
- UK Government (2018), “Our commitment to corporate social responsibility (CSR)”, available at:  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/our-commitment-to-corporate-social-responsibility-csr#:~:text=As%20a%20government%20organisation%20and,our%20employees%2C%20customers%20and%20communities> (accessed 5 December 2023).
- Van De Voorde, K., Paauwe, J. and Van Veldhoven, M. (2012), “Employee well-being and the HRM-organizational performance relationship: a review of quantitative studies”, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 14 No. 4, pp. 391-407.

- Voegtlin, C. and Greenwood, M. (2013), "Corporate social responsibility and human resource management: A systematic review and conceptual analysis", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 181-197.
- Wang, Q., Dou, J. and Jia, S. (2016), "A meta-analytic review of corporate social responsibility and corporate financial performance: the moderating effect of contextual factors", *Business and Society*, Vol. 55 No. 8, pp. 1083-1121.
- Wright, T.A. (2003), "Positive organisational behavior: an idea whose time has truly come", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 437-442.
- Yousaf, S., Rasheed, M.I., Kuar, P., Islam, N. and Dhir, A. (2022), "The dark side of phubbing in the workplace: Investigating the role of intrinsic motivation and the use of enterprise social media (ESM) in a cross-cultural setting", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 143, pp. 81-93.
- Zhang, S. and Tu, Y. (2018), "Cross-domain effects of ethical leadership on employee family and life satisfaction: the moderating role of family-supportive supervisor behaviors", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 152 No. 4, pp. 1085-1097.
- Zilber, T.B. (2011), "The relevance of institutional theory for the study of organizational culture", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 88-93.



**Table 1.** Respondent demographic and employment characteristics

	Absolute frequency	Percentage (where applicable)
<i>Gender</i>		
Female	197	48,88
Male	205	50,87
Prefer not to say	1	0,23
<i>Age (in years)</i>		
Minimum	25	-
Maximum	70	-
Average	40.3	-
Standard deviation	10.3	-
<i>Education</i>		
High school	55	13,65
College	83	20,60
Undergraduate degree	167	41,44
Postgraduate degree	98	24,32
<i>Number of children</i>		
None	96	-
One	96	-
Two	149	-
Three or more	62	-
<i>Age of youngest child (in years)</i>		

Minimum	1	-
Maximum	46	-
Average	12.2	-
Standard deviation	9.3	-

*Type of organization*

Private company	241	59,80
Government agency	79	19,60
Institution	35	8,68
State-owned company	28	6,95
Charity	7	1,74
Other	13	3,23

*Employment level*

Employee	198	49,13
Junior manager	87	21,59
Middle-level manager	78	19,35
Senior manager	40	9,93

*Organizational tenure (in years)*

Min.	1	-
Max.	50	-
Average	10.4	-
Standard deviation	8.9	-

*Average weekly  
working hours*

Minimum	20	-
Maximum	70	-
Average	38.8	-
Standard deviation	5.2	-

*Monthly salary*

Minimum	£700	-
Maximum	£9800	-
Average	£2555	-
Standard deviation	£1317	-

---

**Table 2.** Descriptive statistics

Variable	Size (N)	Min.	Max.	Med.	Sd.	Excess Kurtosis	Skewness
Employee CSR	403	-3.171	1.751	0.138	1.0	0.002	-0.658
Work-family spillover	403	-3.623	1.758	0.170	1.0	0.364	-0.840
Family-work spillover	403	-3.893	1.529	0.143	1.0	1.182	-0.990
Work-family culture	403	-3.224	1.577	0.148	1.0	0.364	-0.840
Employee well-being	403	-3.285	2.113	-0.014	1.0	-0.118	-0.104
Employee lifestyle and habits	403	-3.217	1.934	0.126	1.0	0.200	-0.636

**Table 3.** Constructs reliability and average variance extracted (AVE) for reflective constructs.

Construct and indicator	Loading	Cronbach alpha	rho_A	Composite reliability	AVE
Employee CSR		<i>0.884</i>	<i>0.895</i>	<i>0.912</i>	<i>0.633</i>
1. My organization encourages its employees to participate in voluntary activities.	0.692				
2. My organization's policies encourage employees to develop their own skills and careers.	0.816				
3. The management of my organization is primarily concerned with employees' needs and wants.	0.810				
4. My organization implements flexible policies that provide a good work and life balance for its employees.	0.790				
5. The managerial decisions related to the employees are usually fair.	0.804				
6. My organization supports employees who want to acquire additional education.	0.852				
Work-family spillover		<i>0.940</i>	<i>0.949</i>	<i>0.948</i>	<i>0.629</i>
<i>Affective positive spillover</i>					
1. When things are going well at work, my outlook regarding my family life is improved.	0.655				
2. Being in a positive mood at work helps me to be in a positive mood at home.	0.644				
3. Being happy at work improves my spirits at home.	0.661				
4. Having a good day at work allows me to be optimistic with my family.	0.687				
<i>Behavior-based instrumental positive spillover</i>					

- |  |       |
|--|-------|
| 1. Skills developed at work help me in my family life.   | 0.846 |
| 2. Successfully performing tasks at work helps me to more effectively accomplish family tasks    | 0.863 |
| 3. Behaviors required by my job lead to behaviours that assist me in my family life.             | 0.886 |
| 4. Carrying out my family responsibilities is made easier by using behaviours performed at work. | 0.859 |

*Value-based instrumental positive spillover*

- |  |       |
|--|-------|
| 1. Values developed at work make me a better family member.  | 0.857 |
| 2. I apply the principles my workplace values in family situations.                                    | 0.830 |
| 3. Values that I learn through my work experiences assist me in fulfilling my family responsibilities. | 0.872 |

*Family-work spillover*

0.958      0.959      0.964      0.707

*Affective positive spillover*

- |   |       |
|---|-------|
| 1. When things are going well in my family life, my outlook regarding my job is improved. | 0.776 |
| 2. Being in a positive mood at home helps me to be in a positive mood at work.            | 0.786 |
| 3. Being happy at home improves my spirits at work.                                       | 0.828 |
| 4. Having a good day with my family allows me to be optimistic at work.                   | 0.832 |

*Behavior-based instrumental positive spillover*

- |   |       |
|---|-------|
| 1. Skills developed in my family life help me in my job.  | 0.853 |
| 2. Successfully performing tasks in my family life helps me to more effectively accomplish tasks at work. | 0.859 |

- 3. Behaviors required in my family life lead to behaviours that assist me at work. 0.890
- 4. Carrying out my work responsibilities is made easier by using behaviours performed as part of my family life. 0.865

*Value-based instrumental positive spillover*

- 1. Values developed in my family make me a better employee. 0.829
- 2. I apply the principles my family values in work situations. 0.853
- 3. Values that I learn through my family experiences assist me in fulfilling my work responsibilities. 0.868

*Work-family culture*

0.954      0.956      0.961      0.712

*Managerial Support*

- 1. In general, managers in this organization are quite accommodating of family-related needs.
- 2. Higher management in this organization encourages supervisors to be sensitive to employees' family and personal concerns. 0.877
- 3. Middle managers and executives in this organization are sympathetic toward employees' child care responsibilities. 0.892
- 4. In the event of a conflict, managers are understanding when employees have to put their family first. 0.892
- 5. In this organization, employees are encouraged to strike a balance between their work and family lives. 0.856
- 6. Middle managers and executives in this organization are sympathetic toward employees' elder care responsibilities. 0.870
- 7. This organization is supportive of employees who want to switch to less demanding jobs for family reasons. 0.812

8. In this organization, it is generally okay to talk about one's family at work.	0.709				
9. In this organization, employees can easily balance their work and family lives.	0.840				
10. This organization encourages employees to set limits on where work stops and home life begins.	0.782				
<i>Employee well-being</i>		0.933	0.936	0.949	0.788
1. In the past 2 weeks I have felt cheerful and in good spirits	0.907				
2. In the past 2 weeks I have felt calm and relaxed	0.882				
3. In the past 2 weeks I have felt active and vigorous	0.882				
4. In the past 2 weeks I woke up feeling fresh and rested	0.885				
5. In the past 2 weeks my daily life has been filled with things that interest me	0.881				
<i>Employee lifestyle and habits</i>		0.919	0.939	0.927	0.520
<i>Health &amp; Exercise</i>					
1. I am as physically fit as most people my age.	0.654				
2. I have good physical endurance	0.700				
3. I spend much of my leisure time involved in physical activities like bicycling, hiking, swimming, gardening, or playing competitive sports.	0.553				
4. I participate in vigorous exercise like running, swimming, speed walking, or aerobics dance classes for at least 20 to 30 minutes a day and at least three times a week.	0.529				
5. I try to keep my body healthy and fit.	0.639				
<i>Psychological Health</i>					
1. I am able to manage the stress in my life.	0.833				



2. I am able to relax and unwind.	0.810
3. I am hopeful about the future.	0.809
4. I have clear direction in life.	0.825
5. I am able to concentrate on my work at school or on the job.	0.813
6. I get at least 7- 8 hours of sleep at night and wake up feeling rested and refreshed.	0.632

**Table 4.** Constructs correlations

Constructs	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. CSR Employee	<i>0.796</i>					
2. Work-family spillover	0.523	<i>0.793</i>				
3. Family-work spillover	0.423	0.723	<i>0.841</i>			
4. Work-family culture	0.664	0.500	0.452	<i>0.844</i>		
5. Employee well-being	0.355	0.369	0.393	0.443	<i>0.888</i>	
6. Employee lifestyle and habits	0.337	0.308	0.345	0.388	0.745	<i>0.721</i>

**Note(s):** Diagonal elements (italic figures) are the square root of the variance shared between constructs and their measures. Off-diagonal elements are the correlations among constructs. For discriminant validity, diagonal elements should be larger than off-diagonal.

**Table 5.** Discriminant validity (HTMT ratio)

	Employee CSR	Family- work spillover	Employee lifestyle and habits	Work- family culture	Work- family spillover	Employee well-being
Employee CSR						
Family-work spillover	0.455					
Employee lifestyle and habits	0.322	0.331				
Work-family culture	0.710	0.473	0.382			
Work-family spillover	0.559	0.762	0.305	0.520		
Employee well-being	0.378	0.412	0.773	0.469	0.390	

**Table 6.** Hartman's Single factor analysis

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of variance	Cumulative %
1	20.192	35.425	35.425	20.192	<b>35.425</b>	35.425
2	6.720	11.790	47.215			
3	4.945	8.676	55.891			
4	2.852	5.003	60.894			
5	2.295	4.027	64.921			
6	2.081	3.651	68.573			
7	1.702	2.986	71.559			
8	1.168	2.048	73.607			
9	1.128	1.979	75.587			

**Table 7.** Direct effects on endogenous variables

Effects on variables	Direct effects (Original sample (O))	T value (Bootstrap)	Percentile 97.5% confidence interval	Correlations	Explained variance
<i>Employee CSR</i>					
H1a: Employee well-being	0.046	0.589	[-0.108; 0.196] ns	0.355	0.1%
H1b: Lifestyle and habits	0.099	1.304	[-0.058; 0.243] ns	0.337	0.6%
H2a: Work-to-family	0.523	13.447	[0.446; 0.598] sig	0.523	37.6%
H2b: Family-to-work	0.423	8.863	[0.332; 0.517] sig	0.423	21.9%
H2c: Work-family culture	0.664	18.844	[0.594; 0.731] sig	0.664	79.0%
<i>Work-to-family (R<sup>2</sup> = 0.273)</i>					
H3a: Employee well-being	0.050	0.699	[-0.090; 0.193] sig	0.369	0.1%
H3b: Lifestyle and habits	-0.006	0.086	[-0.150; 0.145] sig	0.345	0.0%
<i>Family-to-work (R<sup>2</sup> = 0.179)</i>					
H4a: Employee well-being	0.204	3.050	[0.070; 0.334] sig	0.393	2.6%
H4b: Lifestyle and habits	0.202	2.917	[0.065; 0.338] sig	0.345	2.3%
<i>Work-Family Culture (R<sup>2</sup> = 0.441)</i>					
H5a: Employee well-being	0.296	4.284	[0.160; 0.431] ns	0.443	6.0%
H5b: Lifestyle and habits	0.235	3.214	[0.096; 0.380] ns	0.388	3.5%

Notes: \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*  $p < 0.05$ , ns: not significant

**Table 8.** Summary of the direct effects of the model (with the mediation effect)

Direct effects	Coefficient	Confidence interval		Bootstrap confidence interval bias corrected		
		Percentile values	2.5%	97.5%	2.5%	97.5%
Employee CSR → Family-to-work	0.000 sig		0.332	0.517	0.327	0.512
Employee CSR → Lifestyle and habits	0.192 ns		-0.058	0.243	-0.059	0.242
Employee CSR → Employee well-being	0.555 ns		-0.108	0.196	-0.102	0.201
Employee CSR → Work-family culture	0.000 sig		0.594	0.731	0.589	0.727
Employee CSR → Work-to-family	0.000 sig		0.446	0.598	0.437	0.590
Family-to-work → Lifestyle and habits	0.004 sig		0.065	0.338	0.065	0.338
Family-to-work → Well-being	0.002 sig		0.070	0.334	0.071	0.335
Work-family culture → Lifestyle and habits	0.001 sig		0.096	0.380	0.094	0.378
Work-family culture → Employee well-being	0.000 sig		0.160	0.431	0.154	0.426
Work-to-family → Lifestyle and habits	0.932 ns		-0.150	0.145	-0.155	0.138
Work-to-family → Employee well-being	0.485 ns		-0.090	0.193	-0.096	0.185

**Table 9.** Summary of the indirect effects of the model (with the mediation effect)

Indirect effects	Coefficient	Confidence interval		Bootstrap confidence interval Bias corrected	
		Percentile values	2.5%	97.5%	2.5%
Employee CSR → Work-to-family → Lifestyle and habits	0.932 ns	-0.080	0.076	-0.084	0.072
Employee CSR → Work-family culture → Employee well-being	0.000 sig	0.104	0.294	0.101	0.291
Employee CSR → Work-to-family → Employee well-being	0.487 ns	-0.048	0.100	-0.051	0.097
Employee CSR → Family-to-work → Lifestyle and habits	0.009 sig	0.026	0.156	0.028	0.158
Employee CSR → Family-to-work → Employee well-being	0.005 sig	0.030	0.151	0.032	0.154
Employee CSR → Work-family culture → Lifestyle and habits	0.002 sig	0.063	0.259	0.062	0.256
<i>Total Indirect Effects</i>					
Employee CSR → Lifestyle and habits	0.000 sig	0.145	0.349	0.137	0.341
Employee CSR → Employee well-being	0.000 sig	0.206	0.426	0.202	0.419

**Figure 1.** Research model

