<div align="center">**Appendix**</div>

Confirmatory factor analysis

CFA was first used to test the discriminant validity of the five constructs in this study. As shown in Table 3, the results indicated that the measurement model with these five factors were distinct and fit the data best ($\chi^2 = 517.492$, $df = 199$, $p < .01$; CFI = .931, TLI = .919, RMSEA = .071, SRMR = .061), and was superior to a 4-factor model ($\chi^2 = 843.371$, $df = 203$, $p < .01$; CFI = .860, TLI = .841, RMSEA = .099, SRMR = .083), 3-factor model ($\chi^2 = 1096.634$, $df = 206$, $p < .01$; CFI = .806, TLI = .782, RMSEA = .116, SRMR = .082), 2-factor model ($\chi^2 = 1869.769$, $df = 208$, $p < .01$; CFI = .637, TLI = .597, RMSEA = .158, SRMR = .118), and 1-factor model ($\chi^2 = 2488.922$, $df = 209$, $p < .01$; CFI = .503, TLI = .450, RMSEA = .184, SRMR = .160; Table 4). Thus, the five substantive constructs in our model were empirically distinguishable.

Table 4

Comparison of Measurement Models

Model	Description	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
Baseline five-factor model	WFC, EE, JM, OI, PI	517.492/199	.931	.919	.071	.061
Four-factor model	WFC and PI were combined into one factor, EE, JM, OI	843.371/203	.860	.841	.099	.083
Three-factor model	WFC, PI and EE were combined into one factor, JM, OI	1096.634/206	.806	.782	.116	.082
Two-factor model	WFC, PI, EE and JM were combined into one factor, OI	1869.769/208	.637	.597	.158	.118
One-factor model	WFC, EE, OI, PI and JM were combined into one factor	2488.922/209	.503	.450	.184	.160

Note. CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual. WFC = Work-family conflict; EE = emotional exhaustion; JM = job meaningfulness; OI = organizational identification; PI = professional identification.