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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

Good conquers the evil and positives can win over the negatives in life. Yet, for centuries, Psychology concerned itself with understanding the negatives present in an individual or the society at large (Seligman, 2002). There has been a lot of research done, which exemplify the evolutionary value of negative emotions. Negative emotions are powerful as they provide the energy for taking instantaneous action against the danger sensed in the environment. Fredrickson (2003) has explained how anger makes a person ready to attack while fear leads to flee response. The negative emotions signal the body’s readiness to cope with challenging situations. Surprisingly, till the beginning of the 21st century there was little known about how positive emotions function or what is their value for the human race.

Martin Seligman can be credited for bringing in the era of Positive Psychology through his now historic presidential address in 1998 at the American Psychological Association (Seligman, 1998). Positive Psychology changed the winds of research from focusing on the flaws in human behaviour to its virtues (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). It brought into focus the role of positivity in human lives. Researches since the late 1990’s started emphasizing on human strengths and its relationship to well-being. Psychologists today are more curious to find out how positive attributes shape a person’s life amid human miseries (for example Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Snyder & Lopez, 2002).

Positive Organizational Behavior stemming from positive psychology is a new approach towards managing people at work. It concerns with the study of people’s strengths; developing and managing them effectively to improve performance at workplace (Luthans, 2002). The present study owns allegiance to the positive psychology tradition.

One of the areas where Positive Organizational Behaviour knowledge extends to is the work-family interface. Earlier studies have mainly focused on understanding the conflict and stress experienced by employees. But, recently the researches are trying to
probe into the positive blend of work and family (Grzywacz, 2000). The present young generation of employees aspires to combine work and family domains in a constructive way. The companies, too, are faced with the question of how to help their employees to achieve this. The present study aimed to explore the emerging concept of work-family enrichment in the Indian milieu and has specifically examined its interdependence with other two relevant constructs namely, perceived social support and Psychological Capital (PsyCap).

To this researcher’s knowledge, the study is among the first attempts to understand PsyCap as it relates to perceived social support and work-family enrichment in the Indian context. Specifically, the study has contributed in three chief ways; first, by exploring the relationship of perceived social support and PsyCap; second, by studying perceived social support and PsyCap as the antecedents of work-family enrichment; and third, by assessing the mediating role of PsyCap in relation to perceived social support and work-family enrichment.

1.2 BASIC CONCEPTS

An individual’s membership in various social groups acts as a resource to him/her and is termed as social support; this is one of the main concepts of the present study. The combination of hope, self efficacy, resilience and optimism has been termed as Psychological Capital or PsyCap by Luthans (2002); and is the other concept used in the study. While the third concept is work-family enrichment and is defined as “The extent to which experiences in one role improves the quality of life in the other role” (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; p. 73). These concepts are further elaborated on in the following section.

1.2.1 Perceived Social Support

Man, being a social being, for most of human history his survival has depended upon his relationship with other fellow beings. Therefore, it can be thought that positive, stable and secure relationships may fulfill a basic, biological need (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Furthermore, social support, said to be a feeling that one is cared for and/ or has assistance from other people in one’s social network, has been examined since a long period and in numerous ways. Caplan, Cobb, Kaplan are credited to be the founding scholars of social support literature (Lakey & Cohen, 2000). Social support has been
studied across many contexts and by many disciplines like anthropology, psychology and sociology. A detailed review of the concept done by Cohen and Syme long back in 1985 laid emphasis on the importance of studying social support by pointing to its potential role in disease management, rehabilitation and wellbeing. Social support has been identified as an important antecedent in work-family researches, too. Since 1950s, social support has been a parsimonious conceptual model for the diversity of psychosocial findings. The following section gives a review of varied definitions of the concept.

Social support defined

The social support literature is full of a variety of definitions. Caplan (1974) emphasized on the counseling aspect of social support while Cobb (1976) understood social support in terms of knowledge. A social support system has been described by Walker, Churchill Jr., & Ford (1977) as a “a set of personal contacts through which the individual maintains his social identity and receives emotional supports, material aid and services, information and new social contacts” (as cited in Malson, 1983). Social support has been defined as the "existence or availability of people on whom we can rely, people who let us know that they care about, value, and love us" (Sarason, Levine, Basham, and Sarason, 1983, p. 127). Etzion (1984) has defined social support as an informal social network that provides individuals with expressions of emotional concern or empathy, practical assistance, informational support or appraisal. Vaux (1988) stressed on social support being a complex exchange process in which the person is actively engaged with his/her support system. While Pender (1996) defined social support as "a subjective feeling of belonging, being loved, esteemed, valued, and needed for oneself, not for what one can do for others" (p. 256).

Social support is different from social capital. The former refers to the characteristic features in relationships, and the latter highlights the hierarchy in its position. Relationships are facilitated based on equality in stature, capital, qualification and socio-cultural factors (Lin, 2001). Social support not just has multiple definitions but also flows from different sources and has varied functions. The important ones are discussed below.
**Sources of social support**

Social Support has been classified in terms of sources of support and types or functions of support. The review of the extant literature suggests that people seek support from workplace sources as well as from non-work sources. Workplace social support is the employees’ perception that their supervisors, co-workers and their organizations overall are concerned about their well-being. It could be termed as workplace supportive climate. On the other hand, non-work related support refers to sources of support outside the organization or workplace mainly referring to spouse, family and friends (Eisenberger, Singhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002).

Social support can be understood in terms of the role it plays. These are enumerated as emotional support, tangible support, informational support, companionship support, general work support and context specific support. These are explained as follows:

- Emotional Support: It is offered by providing words of encouragement, care and love (Slevin *et al.*, 1996). It is basically related to enhancing wellbeing by showing warmth, empathy and trust. It is connected to making the receiver feel valued and nurtured by the different sources of support. It enhances one’s self-esteem and makes one feel good about oneself. Hence, it is also called as appraisal support or esteem support (Wills, 1991).
- Tangible support: This refers to materialistic support (House, 1981). This is usually in the form of money, objects or services like cleaning or cooking. It is a support where the support giver directly helps others in concrete ways. It is also called as instrumental support (Langford, Bowsher, Maloney & Lillis, 1997).
- Informational support: This support is related to giving not just useful suggestions or information; it can also encompass advice and guidance to someone (House, 1981).
- Companionship support: When individuals interact with each other and join the partner in pursuing activities of common interest, it is called companionship support. It leads to a sense of social inclusion (Uchino, 2004).
- General work support: This is the perception of the employee that his supervisor is concerned about his/her global welfare on the job. The supervisor or employer provides adequate resources and engage in interactions that help to improve his/her subjective well-being at work (Eisenberger *et al.*, 2002).
Context Specific support: It is related to the perception of care in the employee that he/she is being supported for a particular job demand or role requirement. Resources are provided to improve the employee’s performance in a particular domain. To illustrate, if an employee is seen to be pre-occupied with family commitments at work, the employer will engage in interactions with him or provide him/her other resources so that he/she can achieve more positive work-family relationships. This support can be called work-family related support (Eisenberger et al., 2002).

No doubt, social support is found to be effective but how does it work? The following section throws light on the different mechanism identified in the relationship between social support and wellbeing.

Mechanisms of social support

Lakey and Cohen (2000) have identified four theoretical perspectives on how social support affects health and wellbeing. These are the Stress and Coping perspective, Appraisal perspective, Social Constructionist perspective, and Relationship perspective. Recently a fifth perspective has been added in the form of Relational Regulation theory (Lakey & Orehek, 2011).

The Stress and Coping perspective of social support proposed that support is in the form of supportive actions. The support is effective when the help rendered matches the demands of the stressor.

The Appraisal view (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) reiterated the role of social support as it helps people interpret stressful situations less negatively. In primary appraisal, the event is appraised for being threatening and secondary appraisal involves evaluations of personal, social resources available to cope with the event. Perceptions of support availability are effective in altering appraisals leading to better wellbeing.

The social constructionist perspective draws from social cognitive thought and the symbolic interactionism. According to this view, social support is based on the people’s perceptions of support. Once these perceptions are made, they are stable beliefs to which new aspects of social support are fitted into. Therefore, those who are high on perceived social support interpret same behaviours in the environment as more supportive than those who are low on perceived social support. The reality of the world would influence the perceived support but it is more influenced by the recipients’ view
of the support giver. Perceived support is closely associated with the recipients’ self evaluations, too.

The relationship perspective predicted that social support is intertwined with the relationship processes. Furthermore, social support would be effective if the quality of relation is good such as having companionship, intimacy and low social conflict.

The latest addition of the relational regulation theory (Lakey & Orehek, 2011) has hypothesized that social support can predict well-being and health when people are able to regulate affect, action or thought by engaging in ordinary conversations and doing simple activities together rather than discussing about how to cope with stress. However, the precise mechanism through which social support benefits well-being is still inconclusive (Ganster, Fusilier, & Mayes, 1986; Gore, 1981).

The appraisal and social constructionist perspective of social support is the cornerstone of this study. Perceived social support is derived from the cognitive judgments that people make regarding their environment and these perceptions of social support are stable and linked to core self evaluations.

**The Direct and Buffering role of social support**

The effects of social support can be attributed to the Direct hypothesis or the Buffering hypothesis. The Direct hypothesis predicts that social support is beneficial all the time, while the Buffering hypothesis predicts that social support is mostly beneficial during stressful times. In other words, in the Direct hypothesis (also called main effects), people with high social support are in better health than people with low social support, regardless of stress. While in the Buffering hypothesis, social support would protect or buffer the person only during high level of stress. There has been empirical evidence for both lines of thought. It has been found that direct effects are most likely to be observed when the social support measures the degree to which a person is integrated in the social network (Thoits, 1985). On the other hand, the buffering hypothesis is partial to the availability of resources or perceived support (Cohen & Syme, 1985).

To summarize, the above discussion on social support indicates that it is multidimensional and complex in nature. Different studies exist which have used the term social support as a variable in the study; but have measured conceptually different aspects of it, like sources or functions or perceived support. The present study is unique
in a way that it is based on perceived social support focusing on availability of support as well as satisfaction with it irrespective of its source and type of support rendered in the context of employees.

1.2.2 Psychological Capital (PsyCap)

Human resources in organizations have been viewed traditionally as Human Capital. It stems from the fact that human resources are assets to the organization for what they know - their knowledge, skills and aptitudes which they bring to the workplace. In the second generation of human resources management, they were viewed as Social Capital. They were valued for their network of social relationships i.e. whom they know. In the latest development, human resources are viewed as Psychological Capital. It is rooted in Positive Organization Behaviour and Positive Psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Roberts, 2006) and as stated earlier is a term put forth by Luthans (2002). It is concerned with an individual’s psychological capacities rather than his knowledge (Human Capital) or whom he knows (Social Capital). These state-like psychological resource capacities of psychological capital or PsyCap constitute the upcoming human resource perspective which is also one of the concepts of the study.

The importance of positive workplace

It is observed that because of globalization and emerging new markets all over the world, the work place is becoming more like a battlefield where each one is striving for success and at the same time fighting the fear of being wiped out. In this scenario, giving higher performance is the need of the hour(Avolio & Luthans, 2006). Friedman (2005) shares that apart from fierce competition amongst organizations; there is unhindered access to information making the corporate world more leveled than ever before. More importantly, it is being realized that one cannot be successful just by fixing up one’s weaknesses. Buckingham and Coffman (1999) state that in today’s work places, success can be attained only by adopting unconventional means and by challenging traditional assumptions and existing paradigms (Thatchenkery & Metzker, 2006).

Over the years how human functions at the highest level could not be understood, as Psychology was preoccupied with dysfunctional behaviours. Seligman (2002) argued that absence of dysfunctionality cannot be equated to excellence. On the
other hand, by focusing on the positive side of human behaviour a lot could be gained by the virtue of its effect on performance especially in the context of work-places. No doubt, the earlier deficits models (Luthans, Youssef & Avolio, 2007) had to be replaced by new approaches that helped individuals achieve their full potential.

**Positive organizational behavior (POB)**

Drawing from positive psychology, Luthans (2002) first introduced the Positive Organizational Behaviour (POB) approach. He has defined POB as “the study and application of positively oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed, and effectively managed for performance improvement in today’s workplace” (p. 59). For any psychological strength to be included in the POB arena, there were certain criteria that they had to meet. The strengths of hope, resilience, efficacy and optimism were the first to be selected as they were not just positive in nature but were strongly backed by theory and empirical researches; and there were psychometric tools available to reliably measure them. More importantly, they all were state like and not trait like. State like meant they were not too transitory or too rigid like the traits. This state like nature makes it possible to develop them through psychological interventions. The descriptions of the four components which were later clubbed to form PsyCap is given below.

**The four positive state-like capacities**

1) Self efficacy:

Self efficacy is borrowed from Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory. Efficacy is the judgment that people make about how well their actions or effort can lead to goal attainment in the future (Bandura, 1986). Stajkovic and Luthans (1998) added to the above definition an important aspect of self efficacy being context specific. A person who is high on efficacy with respect to the technical aspect of a job may show poor self efficacy in the context of communication with customers. According to them, self efficacy is “one’s conviction (or confidence) about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources or courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context” (p. 66). Interestingly Lu, Siu, Chen and Wang (2011) have reported that self efficacy is about perception and may or may not correspond to the actual skill set a person has.
Characteristics of a self efficacious person: Self efficacious person is less likely to be stressed or depressed (Bandura, 1994) as he/she is self-driven, perseverant even in the face of adversity or failure; and makes positive choices (Luthans & Church, 2002). Such persons are not intimidated by the difficult tasks as they perceive such tasks as challenging and have a strong desire to master them (Youssef & Luthans, 2007). They are more accepting of new tasks, willingly put in more efforts and are motivated to see the task to completion (Luthans, Avolio, Avey & Norman, 2007).

2) Optimism:

Seligman (1998) has done a great amount of research on optimism. Optimism as explained by Scheier and Carver (1985) is the cognitive appraisal that one’s future will be a positive one and nothing bad will occur even in the face of adversities. It can lead to unfavourable outcomes if a person is overly optimistic. Hence in POB, optimism is referred to as realistic optimism. Realistic optimism is an objective evaluation of what one can achieve in a stipulated time frame and with the resources at hand. It is also said to be flexible as it can change in response to changing situation (Peterson, 2000).

Characteristics of an optimistic person: An optimist would attribute success at a task to internal stable factors while a pessimist is quick in attributing success to external factors and failure to internal stable aspects of him/her. An optimistic employee has high morale and continues with his/her tasks even in the face of failure.

3) Hope:

Snyder, Irving, and Anderson (1991) define hope as a “motivational state based on an interactively derived sense of a) agency (goal directed behavior), and b) pathways (planning to meet goals)” (p. 287). It consists of motivation to pursue the goal along with the ability to think of multiple routes to achieve the goal. A hopeful person not just thinks of his goal as achievable but he chalks out plans to meet them and has a belief that the plans will lead to the desired goal (Synder, 2002). Hope is different from the other two components of self efficacy and optimism. Optimism does not have formulation of pathways but has the belief that one will be successful in the future. In self efficacy, there is the self-belief in one’s abilities and also the pathway in terms of self efficacy outcome expectancy, yet hope is different because the will power and the
pathways here interact with each other constantly and change repetitively (Luthans et al., 2007).

Characteristics of a hopeful person: A hopeful person is more likely to stick to goals as it is personally important for him. He/She constantly monitor progress and do the necessary realignment to be on track to achieve the goal. He/She is less affected by stressful situation.

4) Resilience:

Resilience has been earlier studied in clinical settings and was found to be a great resource in adapting to change. Luthans (2002) has described resilience beyond just adaptive mechanism and added the ability to bounce back or rebound from failure or in the light of new responsibility. Resilience is different from self efficacy as it is more in the form of reaction while efficacy is a proactive response. It is equal to hope in terms of having pathways but differs from it as there is no agency aspect involved (Luthans, 2002).

Characteristics of a resilient person: A resilient person is adaptable to negative as well as positive situations. He/She is less likely to suffer from stressful situation. Resilient employees exhibit social skills, problem solving skills and have strong sense of commitment to work tasks.

In the year 2003, Luthans and his colleagues were the first to recognize the unique nature of these four positive psychological resource capacities and the tremendous promise they held for modern day organizations (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). They called the composite or combination of the four construct as Psychological Capital or PsyCap.

**Psychological Capital (PsyCap) and its nature**

PsyCap has been comprehensively defined as “an individual’s positive psychological state of development that is characterized by: (1) having confidence (self efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks; (2) making a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; (3) persevering toward goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) in order to succeed;
and (4) when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond (resiliency) to attain success” (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007, p. 3)

PsyCap is a promising construct because though it is formed by the combination of above described unique psychological capacities of hope, efficacy, optimism and resilience, it is proposed as a higher order factor that is far greater in impact than the individual capacities could have by themselves (Luthans et al., 2007). In PsyCap, the four capacities act in a synergistic manner so that individuals can perform consistently at an optimum level. PsyCap is a dormant factor that can derive benefits not just from a single domain but from across the domains. Further, Bryant and Cvengros (2004) have provided empirical evidence by confirmatory factor analysis to show that PsyCap is indeed a second order factor. Its existence is also validated from theoretical viewpoint by taking the support of the Psychological Resource theories mainly postulated by the Broaden and Build theory of Fredrickson. The theory is discussed at length in the succeeding chapter. The PsyCap developed in the initial stage is work-related PsyCap that has huge potential to impact employees’ attitudes and organizational outcomes. These are also discussed in the following chapter.

As envisioned in the POB tradition, the research team of Luthans, Youssef and Avolio (2007) were successful in designing a Psychological Capital Intervention (PCI) which is capable of developing PsyCap through the web-based intervention. It is noteworthy that the PCI model has shown a return on investment and was most of the time capable to bring a 2% rise in PsyCap levels. The implication that the PCI holds is huge. In studies, improvement in leaders’ PsyCap led to more trust and better ratings on leader effectiveness. Such other positive outcomes have made it possible to reap benefits on the investment made in the creation of the intervention (Luthans et al., 2006; Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007).

To conclude, PsyCap as the human resource management perspective reiterates that in today’s world it is the people who make the difference and therefore it is important to focus on people’s self-beliefs.

1.2.3 Work-Family Enrichment

Work and Family are two spheres of our life which are interlinked. Work is defined as an “activity involving mental or physical effort done to achieve a result” or also as “the
period of time one spends in paid employment” (work, p. 641). Whereas, family can be defined as “a group consisting of two parents and their children living together as a unit” or “a group of people related by blood or marriage” (family, p. 200). Therefore, family life would be time spent with the family. In the pre-industrial era where the economy was predominantly agrarian in nature, family and work were closely intertwined as family members contributed to the work on farms. But with the advent of industrial revolution, the men folk started working in factories away from families for long hours to earn a living. Slowly over the years, people’s view about work and its relation to their family life has undergone a sea change moving from the negative effects of work-family conflict to the positive effects of work-family interface. Today, there is greater interest in studying the positive interdependencies of work and family which is called positive spillover or enhancement or facilitation or enrichment in extant literature. The following section helps to understand the journey of work-family researches.

**Historical antecedents of work-family research**

In the following section, an attempt has been made to give a brief account of historical background of work-family research in the West and in India

**Historical background of work-family research in the West**

The western literature indicates that with the advent of woman entering workforce (Henwood, Rimmer, & Wicks, 1987) in the late 1960s, gender role and dual career couple’s experiences drew social scientists’ attention (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971). Studies of Baruch and Barnett (1986) threw light on the consequences of women’s working status on their quality of life. The period of 1980’s showed multiple studies on stress and burnout (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). The highlight of this phase was an inclusion of both genders in the research. The researches thus recognised that the male gender is also negatively affected by participating in multiple roles (e.g. Barling, 1986). This led to the emergence of literature on work-family conflict. In the late 1990’s, research shifted to examine how companies responded to work-family issues (Lewis & Cooper, 1987). Later studies (e.g. Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992) directed their focus at identifying the antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict. In the early part of the 21st century, researchers began to probe into positive aspects of working and having a family.
Historical background of work-family research in India

Work-family research in India has been meta-analyzed by Rajadhyaksha and Smita (2004) using research done in women’s studies, psychology and management. They have identified themes arising in the literature across four phases or decades – independent India, mid 1970s-mid 1980s, mid 1980s-mid 1990s, and mid 1990s-mid 2000s. Their comprehensive work is very informative and shows how research on work-family has been a reaction to the changes happening in the social milieu. Indian studies follow their western counterparts but one can see a time lag of around 10-15 years. Besides, the collectivistic culture adds a different flavor to the native studies.

As per the review done by Rajadhyaksha and Smita, the Independent India phase that extended from 1947 to the mid 70’s was basically characterized by passing of legislatures related to employees’ welfare. These included the Maternity Benefits Act of 1961, the Factories Act of 1948 and the Right to protection from sexual harassment at the workplace.

The mid 1970s –mid 1980s was a time when research on Indian working women proliferated. Since Indian women joined the work force in large numbers, researches focused on the impact of women’s working status on family, children therein and power relationships within the family and marital relationship. Research also tried to throw light on the stressors faced by women to achieve work-family role balance and the impact it had on their well-being (Bharat, 2000).

The mid 1980s -1990s had initial studies (Sekaran, 1984, 1985) more on dual earners and focused on exploration of gender difference in attitudes towards the enactment of multiple roles at work and family. Researchers recognized the fact that Indian dual-worker couples faced unique set of challenges as compared to their western counterparts. The traditional joint families gave way to nuclear families giving young couples independence but at the same time removing the childcare and other support systems. Besides, Indian men continued to maintain the primary provider’s role without sharing domestic chores with their wives who now also shouldered work responsibilities (Ramu, 1987), leading to more conflict, stress and strain for women.

The mid 1990’s-2000’s period was marked by rapid industrialization due to liberalization of Indian economy and the upsurge in the use of information technology
leading to opening of new work sectors like software and information technology enabled services (ITES). With globalization and entry of multinational companies the work ethos changed. Workers were expected to work round the clock. The workplaces began to offer facilities like gymnasium, day care facilities amongst others. Researchers like Devi (2002) have indicated that these were simply imitation of the practices of the west and had less concern for genuine needs of the local employees.

In the first decade of the 21st century the thrust of work-life research in India was on imbalance and its effect on quality of work life and employee health (for example Abhyankar, 2011; Gunarathy & Thenmozhi, 2009; Rao & Mohan, 2008). In the recent times, Indian social scientists have begun to examine work-life balance and work-family enrichment (for example Baral & Bhargav, 2009; Mohanty & Jena, 2016). The present study is in line with the recent trend of probing into the positive aspect of work-life interface.

The next section delves into how the linkages between work and family have been conceptualized in literature.

**Mechanism in work-family relationship**

Edwards & Rothbard (2000), Zedeck & Mosier (1990) and O’Driscoll (1996) have reviewed the relationship between work and family and noted main five linking mechanisms namely spillover, congruence, compensation, segmentation and integration. Besides there is the work-family border theory and role conflict and role accumulation approaches which help understand the mechanisms through which the domains could be connected.

**Traditional approaches**

1) Spillover:

According to Edwards and Rothbard (2000), spillover occurs when the work or family domain are viewed as similar to each other. Here, the experiences in one role affect the experiences in second role due to transference of skill, behaviour, mood and values. The spillover can be positive and negative.
2) Congruence:

Edwards and Rothbard (2000) stated that work and family can be linked positively through congruence. A third factor that is influential on both spheres of work and family can bring about congruence. For example, a supportive boss as a third person may affect both work life (e.g. technical expertise) and family life (e.g. providing leaves for childcare) positively; thus, congruence between work and family is possible.

3) Compensation:

When the shortcomings in one domain role are dealt by engaging to a greater degree in the other domain role, it is called compensation (Edwards & Rothbard 2000; Zedeck, 1992). For example, an individual may feel like a failure in meeting the demands of family life, may start showing higher amounts of involvement at work. This involvement further provides him/her sense of importance in the family domain.

4) Segmentation:

In this approach work and family are viewed as two distinctive domains or spheres that have no sway on the other (Zedeck & Moiser, 1990). Though, initially the two domains were thought as distinct separated by physical distance and time, later this was replaced by a impermeable boundary (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Nippert-Eng, 1995). Segmentation is also viewed as an active psychological process that may be used as managing a boundary between work and family (Kossek, Noe, & DeMarr, 1999).

5) Integration:

The integration approach views the two domains as being closely associated with the other. The overlap is so much that each loses its own distinct identity. Hence it is also known as the identity approach (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000).

6) Work-family border theory:

The work-family border theory believes that the two domains of work and family retain their distinctiveness just as in the segmentation theory but the differential part is that the border between the two is permeable. So, that individual crosses the border daily (Clark, 2000). The influence they have over each other is due to the permeable nature of the border (Guest, 2002).
7) Role conflict - role accumulation:

Sieber (1974) defines a role according to that of Merton (1957) as a “pattern of expectations, which apply to a particular social position and which normally persist independently of the personalities occupying the position” (p. 569). There is a role typology based on role involvement suggested by Tiedje et al. (1990) which is role conflict (Goode, 1960) and role enhancement or role accumulation theory (Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974). Role conflict is a result of role strain that is caused due to the unequal proportion of demands placed to the resources available to the individual while engaging in multiple roles (Goode, 1960). The role enhancement or role accumulation theory suggests that engaging in multiple roles gives rise to rewards such as role-privileges, security, resources for status enhancement and role performance, enrichment of the personality and ego gratification (Sieber, 1974).

To sum up, the traditional approaches have been empirically tested and found to exist and many times also acted simultaneously (Lambert, 1990). Though insightful, they are not found to be enough to understand work-family interface completely. Therefore, the next section takes a review of contemporary approaches.

Contemporary approaches

1) Identity theory:

The role which one plays is closely related to one’s identity (Stryker & Serpe, 1982). According to Rothbard and Edwards (2003), the closer one identifies with a particular role family or work; more the person will invest his/her resource of time in it. Interestingly, individuals who identify with both the domains equally experience integration and are seen to suffer from work-family conflict as compared to those who had unequal identification (Dumas, 2003).

2) Conflict-Facilitation:

Work-family conflict is “a form of inter-role conflict, in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect. That is, participation in one role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in another role” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985 p.77). The conflict takes place in both directions namely, work-to-family and family to work. Moreover, Work-family facilitation is “the extent to
which participation in one role is made easier by virtue of the experiences, skills, and opportunities gained or developed in another role” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 77). The negative interdependency of conflict has been widely studied whereas the facilitation approach has few researches to show (Frone, 2003).

3) Conflict-Enrichment:

The conflict approach as stated earlier, refers to the negative associations between work and family and the positive association between work and family is the enrichment approach. Work-family enrichment is defined as “the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role. Work-family enrichment occurs when work experiences improve the quality of family life; whereas family-work enrichment occurs when family experiences improve the quality of work life” (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006, p. 73). The research related to enrichment is small in quantum as opposed to the conflict and it definitely needs to grow (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000).

4) Conflict, Enrichment and Balance:

It becomes necessary to conceptually distinguish between work-family balance, work-family conflict and work-family enrichment. Conflict and enrichment are mechanisms which connect the two domains of work and family (Marks & MacDermid, 1996). Conflict indicates the level of negative interdependencies between work and family whereas enrichment indicates the positive exchanges between work family domains (Carlson, Grzywacz & Zivnuska, 2009). Both these mechanisms exist at the individual level. The global view of work-family domain is called balance (Carlson et al., 2009). Carlson et al. (2009) supported this view through their empirical study which found that balance is different from conflict and enrichment, and explained more variance than the other two. The following section explains the theoretical foundation of work-family enrichment using the model proposed by Greenhaus and Powell in 2006.

5) Work-Family Enrichment Model:

The work-family enrichment model proposed by Greenhaus and Powell (2006) provides a framework on how the phenomenon of work-family enrichment occurs, the resources necessary for it and charts the pathways through which it occurs. The present study on work-family enrichment draws from it.
The model posits that work-family enrichment occurs when resources generated through participation in Role A (i.e., work or family) are applied and promote either increased performance or positive affect in Role B (i.e., family or work), thus increasing the quality of life in Role B. The transfer of resources and improvement in performance is a must. It is bi-directional and is called work-to-family enrichment and family-to-work enrichment.

A resource is defined as “an asset that may be drawn on when needed to solve a problem or cope with a challenging situation” (Greenhaus and Powell, 2006, p. 80). The authors have identified and defined five types of resources that promote work-family enrichment: skills and perspectives, psychological and physical resources, social-capital resources, flexibility and material resources.

Skills and perspectives refer to cognitive and task-related interpersonal skills. Perspective deals with handling situations and respecting differences, while skills focus on coping and multi-tasking abilities obtained through role experience. Psychological resources include self-esteem and self efficacy, as well as positive emotions about the future. Physical resources refer to increasing energy, mental sharpness and stamina. Social-capital resources are interpersonal relationships developed at work or through family participation that help individuals achieve their goals. Flexibility refers to an individual’s ability to determine the timing, pace, and location where role requirements are met. Material resources include money and gifts obtained from work and family roles.

Additionally, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) also indicated that resources promote work-family enrichment primarily through two different paths: instrumental and affective. The instrumental pathway is revealed when employees believe that their family involvement has prepared them with resources necessary to handle co-workers or that these resources have increased their ability to perform on the job (e.g. Carlson et al., 2006). Figure 1.1 depicts the model of work-family enrichment of Greenhaus and Powell (2006) as adapted by Fung, Ahmad and Omar (2014). In the instrumental path (arrow 1), resource gains at Role A (either work or family) have a direct effect on the role, and the application results in improved performance in that role. The affective path (arrow 5) promotes work-family enrichment indirectly through influence on moods and emotions resulting from role participation (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). More specifically, as individuals gain greater
resources through ongoing participation in Role A/Role B (i.e., work or family), their mood or emotional state in that role also increases (arrow 4 and arrow 6). This can aid their performance in the other role (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). The affective path promotes positive affect in the same role in which it was generated and results in an increased performance in the other role (arrow 5).

**Figure 1.1: Model of Work-Family Enrichment**

The present study uses the nomenclature of work-family enrichment to refer to the bidirectional construct of work-to-family and family-to-work. While work-to-family enrichment refers to enrichment of family domain because of participation in work role and family-to-work enrichment refers to enrichment of work domain because of participation in family role.

### 1.3 THE PRESENT STUDY

This section deals with the rationale and significance, statement of the problem and objectives of the study.

#### 1.3.1 Rationale and Significance of the Study

Work-family interface has been the focus of research in the Western countries. The research unveiled how changing demographics, social structures along with large numbers of women joining work force impacted the employee lives. With the turn of the century there was renewed interest in the dual income families, having care giving
responsibilities towards both children and aging parents, and how they managed work and family responsibilities effectively (Neal & Hammer, 2007). Centers for work and family research in a range of disciplines such as sociology, psychology, organizational behavior, labor economics, industrial relations, management, demography and women’s studies were established in many developed countries (Drago & Kashian, 2003). In contrast, emerging economies have been slow to pick up the trend (Bhalla & Kaur, 2011) and research on positive interdependencies of work and family are far less.

India is witnessing great changes in socio-economic milieu. The Goldman Sachs report of 2003 (as cited from Rajadhyaksha, 2012) states that; India has ten of the 30 fastest-growing urban areas in the world and 700 million people are projected to move to the cities by 2050. Furthermore, the report also states that India’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita is expected to increase four times and surpass the USA by 2043. According to McKinsey Global Institute (2007) India’s urban middle class is expected to grow from about 5 percent of the population (50 million) to 40 percent (580 million), making it the world’s fifth largest consumer market. Mobility to urban areas and increase in income will necessarily have a huge impact on family structures in India. In particular, it can be expected that distribution of work and family roles along gender and class lines would experience major shifts (Rajadhyaksha, 2012). This makes it important for the Indian organizations to start focusing on steps to be taken that can help employees manage the work and family lives effectively. Towards this goal the contribution of this study can be termed valuable.

The present study clarifies the role of perceived social support and PsyCap in the work-family enrichment process. Cohen (1986) has pointed out that there is variability in the effectiveness of support and therefore has emphasized the need to identify the characteristics of those who are likely to benefit most and least from social support. Further, in a recent study on impact of PsyCap on employee well-being over time (Avey, Luthans, Smith & Palmer, 2010), it has been suggested that future research should incorporate social resources too. While research has been done on identifying the antecedents and consequences of the work-family enrichment construct in India, there is no research published till date which examines together the role of PsyCap and perceived social support in the work-family enrichment. The present study is first of its kind and bridges the gap in knowledge with regard to how the Indian employees
measure on positive construct of PsyCap and whether it acts as a mediator in the relationship between perceived social support predict and work-family enrichment.

Understanding the benefits of combining work and family will assist employees in their quests for greater satisfaction in life. It will also help employers to attract and retain the competent and experienced employees as well improve organizational productivity. The study would be particularly meaningful for practitioners as they consider specific intervention and implementation strategies to help employees integrate work and family more effectively in the Indian scenario.

1.3.2 Statement of the problem

Since work-family enrichment is a recently emerged concept, there is a paucity of research in this field. It was therefore thought necessary to address the issue and conduct research to study the antecedents of work-family enrichment. The present research was designed to study the relationship of social support with PsyCap and work-family enrichment; and, to probe into the mediating role of PsyCap in the relationship between social support and work-family enrichment.

1.3.3 Objectives of the Study

1. To measure perceived social support, PsyCap, and work-family enrichment of employees.
2. To investigate the relationship between perceived social support, PsyCap and work-family enrichment.
3. To study if PsyCap plays a mediating role in the relationship between social support and work-family enrichment.
4. To explore gender differences on the specified variables of social support, PsyCap and work-family enrichment.
5. To understand the phenomenon of work-family enrichment through the lived experiences of employees.
1.4 SUMMARY

The present chapter discusses the nature of perceived social support, PsyCap and work-family enrichment. Social support has been studied for many decades now and is found to have multiple functions. While PsyCap is a recently coined term and comes from the positive psychology tradition. Furthermore, Work-family enrichment is the positive enhancement of both spheres due to resource transfer and its utilisation in both spheres. The chapter sheds light on the mechanism of support as well as work-life. The Construct of PsyCap along with four components of hope, self efficacy, resilience and optimism are elaborated upon. Though these constructs appear similar yet they are different. The nature of PsyCap being malleable it holds a promise for human resource development strategies. The journey of work-life research in the Western countries and that of India is traced. The model of Greenhaus and Powell is deliberated upon. The rationale and significance of the study has been explained along with enumerating the various objectives of the study.