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CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 OVERVIEW

The previous chapter described the variables of the study while the following chapter attempts to review the existing literature with respect to those variables. Initially, the theoretical bases of the study are explained. It is followed by the review of work-family enrichment, its various antecedents and consequences. Then the relationship between it and other variables is reviewed. The review for PsyCap as mediator is also elucidated at the end.

2.2 THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

The present study is the first of its kind, studying the role of perceived social support – availability and support satisfaction in work-family enrichment. It also examines the role of Psychological Capital (PsyCap) in mediating this relationship. The following section attempts to link the three concepts through well-established theories.

Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory

The conservation of resources (COR) theory of Hobfoll (2001) is an influential theory in the research areas of both stress and motivation. The uniqueness of this theory is that it draws from positive psychology to explain how people try to maintain positive health and well-being while using resources available to them. Resources here could be anything that people value, such as self-esteem, feelings of being resilient, close relationships, inner peace, as well as materialistic objects such as houses and cars or any other form of energies like time, money, skills. The primary premise of this theory is that people are constantly trying to acquire new resources, maintain the ones they have and invest the present resources to build new resources. This is called the resource reinvestment cycle.

According to this theory, stress is experienced in three situations. Firstly, when there is a perception of loss of a resource; secondly, when there is an actual loss of resource; and thirdly when investment in resources does not lead to acquisition of a desired resource. Just as people try to safeguard the resources they have in their resource
reservoir, they are also required to expend them to function optimally in the environment. The individual is in well-being state when the rate of acquiring resources is greater than the rate of relinquishing the resources.

The COR theory states that individuals are more prone to prevent resource loss and so try to maintain status quo by not further investing in resources but this might backfire resulting in further losing more resources. This is called resource loss spiral. At the same time individuals who have greater number of resources are more likely to be resistant to resource loss, are more likely to solve a problem creatively and are more likely to engage in activities that would add to their resources leading to resource gain spiral.

The postulates of the COR theory form a base of the present study. Perceived social support and PsyCap are valuable resources which people try to acquire, preserve and build upon. Presence of good social ties enable people to develop newer resources of efficacy, hope, optimism and resiliency and the synergistic effect of the compounded resources i.e. PsyCap. PsyCap and social support singly or in unison lead to the phenomenon of work-family enrichment.

From the above discussion, it can be hypothesized that social support is positively associated with PsyCap and work-family enrichment; and PsyCap is positively associated with work-family enrichment.

**The Job Demands – Resources Model**

The Job Demands - Resources model is based on the assumption that every profession has two general factors that can predict job stress (Bakker, Demerouti, De Boer & Schauli, 2003; Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). These are job demands and job resources. The model is therefore applicable to different types of professions irrespective of the specific demands they place or resources they offer.

Job demands refer to those psycho-social, physical or work context-specific aspects of the job that need either physical or mental or both efforts. This necessarily entails a certain physical or psychological cost. Long work hours and poor infrastructure are examples of job demand. Although job demands may not be harmful but they have the potential to become stressors if the employee must invest high efforts consistently on the job and is not given an opportunity to recuperate (Meijman & Mulder, 1998).
Job resources refer to those psycho-social, physical or work context specific aspects of the job that lead to successful goal accomplishment, decrease in the levels of job demands and as well initiate learning and development in an employee. Thus, job resources are needed not just to meet job demands but also to achieve other valuable goals/resources. Job resource can exist at multiple levels starting from the organization wide job resource to interpersonal level to task level.

Further, Job demands over a sustained period or in conditions of lack of job resources, leads to exhaustion, poor health and eventually job strain (Leiter, 1993). This is termed as the psychological process of health impairment. On the other hand, adequate presence of job resources leads to enthusiasm, involvement and work productivity. This is called the psychological process of motivation. Job resources play both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational role. In the intrinsic role, job resource fosters employee growth, learning and development and through the extrinsic role it achieves important work goals.

While relating to the present study, social support and PsyCap can be viewed as important job resource which can protect employees from the ill effects of job stress and more importantly can motivate them towards accomplishing work tasks as well as can lead to personal growth and development. This can predispose individuals to achieve work-family enrichment through the instrumental and affect pathways as proposed by Greenhaus and Powell (2006). Therefore, from this perspective too, it can be hypothesized that perceived social support and PsyCap are antecedents of work-family enrichment.

**Broaden and Build Theory**

Fredickson’s Broaden and Build theory over the years has firmly established itself in the science of wellbeing. The theory champions the value of positive emotion in optimal human functioning. This theory also serves as a theoretical base to the construct of PsyCap used in the study.

The famous theory of Fredrickson (1998) highlights the value of positive emotion in enhancing peoples’ cognition and behavior, which over a period helps to develop resources that are physical, intellectual as well as psycho-social in nature. Positive emotions as compared to neutral emotions widen the scope of thoughts and
action tendencies. For example, joy creates the urge to dance and to be creative. These, over a period, can result in an accumulation of personal resources. Therefore, though the positive emotional state may be transitory, yet it can help build resources that are durable. These resources can then be used in any other time and emotional state. The theory also predicts that an individual, through constant experience of positive emotions, can escape the effect of negative arousal leading to resiliency. It also aids him/her to acquire different resources triggering upward spiral of well-being in the future, which ultimately can transform the person for the better. This is referred to this as optimal human functioning or human flourishing that makes individuals healthier, more socially integrated, knowledgeable, effective and creative (Fredrickson & Kurtz, 2011).

In the context of present study, PsyCap development can be attributed to the positive emotions that would accrue due to the presence of helpful others. The individuals high on PsyCap over a period can reach the flourishing state, which can help them aspire and achieve work-family enrichment. Therefore, PsyCap can play a mediating role between perceived social support and the work-family enrichment.

Refer Figure 2.1 for the summary of the three theoretical bases used in the study
Figure 2.1: Summary of the Three Theoretical Bases used in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Relevance in Present Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of Resources. (COR)</td>
<td>• Valuable resources help acquire, preserve and build more resource</td>
<td>Leads to Resource Gain Spiral. Helps to build more resources</td>
<td>Answers the question how new resources are generated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Demands-Resources</td>
<td>• Job resources help meet job demands. • They stimulate personal growth and learning. • It is motivational in nature</td>
<td>Improves work – engagement and leads to better performance</td>
<td>Improves role performance at family and enhances positive affect at family through instrumental and affective path.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broaden &amp; Build</td>
<td>• Positive emotions expand action - thought repertoire. • Transitory emotion leads to durable resources.</td>
<td>Leads to Flourishing state – transforms person to being creative, healthier and resilient.</td>
<td>Explains how PsyCap develops from perceived social support and how it leads to work-family enrichment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 WORK-FAMILY ENRICHMENT

Early studies on positive effects of work-life intersection can be traced to last three decades. A review of the extant literature indicates there are certain issues those plaque the positive work-life research. First, numerous studies (e.g., Grzywacz, 2000; Sieber, 1974; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) have used constructs like positive spillover, facilitation, enhancement and enrichment. In the initial literature, these constructs are interchangeably used. Though these constructs seem similar, a scrutiny shows that authors have defined them differently. These multiple definitions have caused problems
in theory building and deriving consistent results (Carlson et al, 2006; Frone, 2003). Second issue is related to measurement of the constructs. Not all researches have employed tools that are psychometrically sound. This hampers the comparison of the results from various studies in a meaningful way (Carlson et al, 2006). Third, the processes behind the positive effects are not well understood (Grzywacz & Butler, 2005). Additionally, after a surge of research in the Western context, the constructs are being studied in diverse cultural contexts like China, Hongkong, Malaysia, and India. In the Eastern side of the world, the studies are far less than those in the West. Also, cross cultural studies form a very small part of the research literature. These issues are expected of any area of research that is in its nascent stage. The following section presents a comprehensive review covering different antecedents, demographics as well as consequences studied in the relation to work-family enrichment.

Occurrence of Positive spillover was first studied by Crouter (1984). He was especially interested in the family-to-work spillover. He found that family support, skills and perspectives developed in the home domain are used in the workplace.

In an early study done on enrichment, Kirchmeyer (1992) successfully demonstrated that time spent and involvement in non-work domains namely community involvement and recreation, was positively correlated with organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The relationship was not significant for parenting role involvement. Besides, in another study (1993), she found that active coping was associated with positive family-to-work spillover and it was more predictive than gender in a sample of managers.

Grzywacz and Marks (2000) did an extensive research on work-family spillover and tested many hypotheses. They found that there was a gender difference from work-to-family positive spillover and the female gender were found to be higher. Besides, fathers scored better than men without children on positive work-to-family spillover. This finding was not supported in women. This indicates that the association between parenting role and work-to-family spillover differs by gender. Further, family related factors like criticism or burden were studied. Women who had less family criticism or burden showed high family-to-work positive spillover. Again, the relationship was not found in men. Work factors like low decision latitude at work was correlated with poor positive spillover from family to work. Also, surprisingly women working part time showed less positive spillover from family-to-work.
In the same study, when researchers controlled for family and work factors, they found demographic variables being associated with spillover. Age was an important correlate but again it worked differentially in men and women. Older men reported more family-to-work spillover than younger men; while, younger women reported more work-to-family spillover than their older counterparts. For educational and income levels, women with lower education and lower income showed lower levels of work-to-family spillover. The same did not occur in men.

Additionally, in another study by the same researchers (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000), personality factors were studied with spillover. They found that women high on neuroticism experienced low work-to-family spillover. Both genders high on extraversion had higher levels of bi directional spillover.

Both the studies made valuable contribution in understanding the role of family, work, demographics and personality factors; and underlined the unique associations they had with both genders.

Similar results were obtained in the study of Grzywacz, Almeida and McDonald (2002). Elderly employees and women experienced higher work-family spillover while black and married employees experienced more family-to-work spillover. Workers in service sector were higher in work-to-family spillover than those working in technical jobs but less than those working in farming, fishing or forest. This study shows the importance of social structural context in experience of positive work-life effects.

With respect to consequences, work-family facilitation was favourably related to job satisfaction and work effort; there was no relationship between work-family facilitation and family satisfaction (Wayne, Musisca & Fleeson, 2004). Moreover, it was negatively associated with family effort. Family-work facilitation was only related to job effort, and not job satisfaction. But, family-work facilitation was positively related to family satisfaction and family effort. The researches have no theoretical explanation to offer for their findings. Besides, the tool used was an un-established measure of facilitation.

Hill (2005) reported that work-family facilitation, particularly, work-to-family facilitation is positively related to job satisfaction and life satisfaction, and negatively related to individual stress. He also found that family-to-work facilitation is positively
related to marital satisfaction, family satisfaction, and life satisfaction; and negatively related to organizational commitment.

The first meta-analysis on the positive side of the work–family interface was done by McNall, Nicklin and Masuda in 2009. Their study investigated the relationship of work-to-family and family-to-work enrichment with work-related, non-work-related and health-related consequences using meta-analysis. A review of 21 studies (54 correlations) for work-to-family enrichment and 25 studies (57 correlations) for family-to-work enrichment was done. It was found that both directions were positively related to job satisfaction, affective commitment, and family satisfaction but not turnover intentions. Work-to-family was more strongly related to work-related variables, whereas family-to-work was more strongly related to non-work related variables. It was also found that both were positively related to physical and mental health. Additionally, moderators influenced the relationships. The moderators identified were proportion of women in the sample as well as the construct label (e.g., enrichment, facilitation, positive spillover).

In India, the pioneering work in this area can be said to be of Bhargava and Baral (2009). The researchers reported a positive association of work-family enrichment with job satisfaction, psychological well-being, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior as well.

Insights

The review points at the following gaps in research: The future investigators should be clearly mentioning the construct they wish to examine from the plethora of terms that are available and stick to it without interchanging it with other one. The tool used should be a valid and reliable one based on strong theoretical bases like the one built by Carlson et al., (2006) and used in the present study. The Greenhaus and Powell’s model is an example of sound conceptualization of the positive interface which is open to be tested by valid tools like Carlson’s. Besides, new tools need to be built or present tool need to be adapted taking into consideration diverse cultural contexts. Furthermore, there is a gap in literature for identifying antecedents and consequences of work-family enrichment while validating new models and paths of the phenomenon. The present research filled this gap by examining perceived social support and PsyCap as predictors
of work-family enrichment; and more importantly by studying the mediating role of PsyCap in the relationship in a collectivistic country like India.

2.4 PERCEIVED SOCIAL SUPPORT AND WORK-FAMILY ENRICHMENT

Literature has vast number of studies depicting the role of social support in work-family conflict. For the positive side of work-life interface, there are relatively fewer studies.

Beginning with studies from the west side of the world, review shows that family support is crucial in helping employees achieve their work goals. It motivates them to put more effort at work (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). Family helps by providing advice, love, affection and expectations to work hard (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000).

Autonomy in decision making and family support were found to be antecedents of role development while role development was associated with positive spillover (Grzywacz and Marks, 2000). In both genders, support from spouse and family in terms of affection, love and trust enhanced the levels of positive spillover from family to work. When an individual has supportive co-workers, and receives proper feedback from his/her supervisor, he/she will be successful in completing the work tasks and goals (Bakker, Demerouti, & Dollard, 2008). Thus, it can be strongly argued that social support is one of the most important antecedents of work-family enrichment (Frone, 2003).

Support that comes from the personal role can help to enhance the quality of life in the work role and it has a significant relationship with work-family enrichment among women. This was revealed through a recent study by Hennessy (2007). The study had 161 employed women as participants.

Mauno and Rantanen (2012) differentiated between contextual coping resources and dispositional resources. Social support and control (contextual coping resources) were more strongly associated with work-family conflict and work-family enrichment than coping style (dispositional resource). Congruent with the earlier reported findings of the Meta analytic study (McNall, Nicklin & Masuda, 2009), the researchers found that family related factors predicted conflict and enrichment from that domain. Thus, spousal support and sense of control predicted family-to-work conflict and family-to-
work enrichment. Whereas colleague support, supervisor support and sense of control predicted work-to-family conflict and work-to-family enrichment. It is interesting to note that those employees who were high on context-related resources and dispositional resources showed the most positive outcome that is low conflict and high levels of enrichment. This study indicates that both context factors available in the environment and the dispositional aspects confined to the individual are important in work-family enrichment.

Work-to-family enrichment can occur only when there is transferability of work related resources (O'Driscoll, Brough & Kalliath, 2006). It implies that mere existence of a resource in a domain is not sufficient. The resource should be optimally utilized and transferred to the other domain. This is crucial for work-family enrichment.

In the Eastern world, Social support was found to be related to work-family enrichment. In a Chinese sample, spouse support, family support, colleague support and supervisor support were related to both work-to-family enrichment and family-to-work enrichment (Lu, Siu, Spector & Shi, 2009). More interestingly, social support from spouses, supervisors and coworkers were better predictors of work-to-family enrichment and family-to-work enrichment than the support that was received from paid or elderly domestic helpers. This indicates that with respect to social support, “who” supports is more important.

Job characteristics and supervisor support were the predictors of work-to-family enrichment and core self-evaluations. While support from family and supervisor emerged as predictors of family-to-work enrichment in an Indian sample (Bhargava& Baral, 2006). The researchers also reported work-life balance policies and family-friendly culture of the organizations as the significant predictors of work-family enrichment. Work-family enrichment was found to be associated with employee job satisfaction, well-being, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

Role of mediators in the relationship between social support and work-family enrichment has also been probed in different studies. The link between social support and work-family enrichment is found to occur through work engagement. Siu, Lu, Brough and Bakker (2010) reported that among the different job resources, support was
associated with both work-to-family and family-to-work enrichment. Additionally, this relation was mediated by work engagement.

Amongst Malaysian Nurses, social support was associated with life satisfaction and; and work-life enrichment partially mediated the relationship (Rashid, Nordin, Omar & Ismail, 2011). Similar findings were obtained in an Indian setting though the mediating role was not examined. Gayathri and Karthikyan (2014) reported that work support and family support was positively associated with life satisfaction and work-life enrichment.

There are a few studies which show that social support and its related concepts may not be a predictor of work-family enrichment. Gordon, Whelan-Berry and Hamilton (2007) failed to show that organizational work–family culture was a predictor of work–family enhancement. Aryee, Srinivas and Tan (2005) similarly did not find the relationship between social support and enrichment. Yet these studies are far too few.

**Insights**

The review indicates that social support has widely been studied in various cultural settings and is associated with work-life conflict as well as work-life enrichment. Majority of studies focused on two major sources of support namely work and family. Work support referred to support from supervisor and colleagues and family support included spouse and kinship support. Support was also conceptualized as supportive organizational climate or culture and in the form of work-life benefits and policies. Yet, no study was found which measured satisfaction with support received. Therefore, this gap in literature was filled in the present study which used perceived support in terms of availability and satisfaction with support. Based on the above-mentioned review, social support was hypothesized to be positively correlated with the bi-directional work-life enrichment.

### 2.5 PSYCAP AND WORK-FAMILY ENRICHMENT

Before the link between PsyCap and work-family enrichment is reviewed, it was thought necessary to review the researches done on PsyCap and its components. In a span of a decade, there are plenty of researches done in a variety of settings which shows that PsyCap is a promising variable to study. A brief review of PsyCap and its components follows.
PsyCap research especially in the Western world already spans a variety of settings, contributing to its external validity. PsyCap is strongly found to relate to multitude of performance (Avey, Reichard, Luthans, & Mhatre, 2011). It is associated with managers, with performance of employees from manufacturing sector as well as service sector and with creative task (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007). It has been positively related to employee attitudes like job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job search behaviours and empowerment; and negatively related to cynicism, absenteeism and intention to quit (Larson & Luthans, 2006; Avey, Luthans & Youssef, 2010; Avey, Luthans & Jensen, 2009). Specifically, it is related to measures of well-being, adding a small but significant, variance over time.

Interestingly, the predictors of PsyCap are identified as supportive climate (Luthans, Norman, Avolio & Avey, 2008), transformational leadership, authentic leadership and situational complexity (Avey, Hughes, Norman, & Luthans, 2008; Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang & Avey, 2009).

PsyCap development intervention which was discussed in chapter one is found to increase performance (Luthans et al., 2006), and increased managers’ perceptions of PsyCap leading to increased trust and higher evaluations of leadership effectiveness (Norman, Avolio, & Luthans, 2010).

Not just in the Western countries, but PsyCap has been extensively studied in the Eastern world especially in China (Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa & Li, 2005), Southeast countries like Taiwan, Malaysia (Luthans, Zhu & Avolio, 2006), Central Asia (Luthans & Ibrayeva, 2006), Africa (Luthans, Van Wyk & Walumba, 2004) and the Middle East (Youssef & Luthans, 2003).

A research review on the components of the PsyCap reveals the following: In the workplace, hope has been found to be related to Chinese factory workers’ supervisory rated performance (Luthans, et al., 2005), unit financial performance, employee satisfaction and employee retention (Peterson & Luthans, 2003), and employee performance, satisfaction, happiness, and commitment (Youssef & Luthans, 2003).

Resilience of employees who were undergoing organizational change and transformation was positively associated with their performance as rated by the supervisor in a sample of Chinese factory workers (Luthans, et al., 2005). Resilience has
also been found to be related to work attitudes of satisfaction, happiness, and commitment (Youssef & Luthans, 2003). Seligman (1998) did find that optimism was significantly and positively related to the performance of insurance sales agents. In addition, in the study of the Chinese factory workers mentioned previously by Luthans, et al., (2005), optimism was also found to have a significant relationship with rated performance. The study by Youssef and Luthans (2003) found that employees’ optimism was related to their performance, satisfaction, and happiness. In a meta-analysis consisting of 114 studies, a strong positive relationship was found between self-efficacy and work-related performance (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). Following the review of PsyCap, it can be understood that PsyCap research is well documented and is taking place worldwide. It suggests the potential this concept holds for organization and its employees.

The above review is followed by establishing the link between PsyCap and work-family enrichment. Initially the link is explored from the PsyCap literature and later it is examined from work-life literature. The PsyCap literature points to just one study which shows positive association between PsyCap and work-life balance (Siu, 2013). Therefore, the present study is unique in its contribution to PsyCap research in relation to work-family enrichment, especially in the Indian setting. Since there is paucity of empirical research, the link between PsyCap domains and work-family enrichment is explored. Apart from quoting empirical studies, the association is hypothesized based on the characteristics of the domains and its possible application in work-family enrichment.

**Self-efficacy and Work-Family Enrichment**

Self-efficacy makes a difference in how people think, feel, and act (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008). People with high self-efficacy choose to perform more challenging tasks, explore their environment, or create new ones (Bandura, 1997). As one of the personality-based resources, self-efficacy is a component of core self-evaluations (CSE). For example, Hobfoll (2002) notes “those who possessed high levels of self-efficacy might be more capable of selecting, altering, and implementing their other resources to meet stressful demands” (p. 308). High self-efficacious individuals may be more equipped to and more successful at utilizing resources gained by participating in one role for the benefit of the other role. Individuals higher in self-efficacy tend to acquire new skills, knowledge, values, perspective, opportunities, positive mood,
confidence and economic assets of their work, which can contribute towards benefiting their family (Carlson et al., 2007).

Noraani, Aminah, Jegak and Khairuddin (2011) conducted a study in Malaysia on 240 single mothers aged 45 and below and having at least one child. The results showed that as the level of self-efficacy of single mothers increased, their level of work-family facilitation also increased. Similarly, McNall, Masuda, Shanock and Nicklin (2011) found that components of Core Self Evaluations that includes self-efficacy is positively related to work-family enrichment.

**Optimism and Work-Family Enrichment**

Optimistic person as compared to the pessimistic one is more likely to view the world in positive light. They are found to have beliefs that good things will happen to them even when they are in adverse conditions. These people can be expected to cope better because of the flexibility in use of coping styles. These qualities predispose these individuals towards work-family enrichment.

Besides, review of literature on optimism indicates that there is a natural tendency of extraverted individuals to remain optimistic (Zellars & Perrewé, 2001). Wayne et al., (2004) indicate that extraversion is a personality factor that contributes to the occurrence of work-family enrichment, both work-to-family enrichment and family-to-work enrichment. In the doctoral thesis of Dyson-Washington (2006) it was reported that optimism is positively associated with work-to-family enrichment and family-to-work enrichment. Optimism was also positively associated with job satisfaction, family satisfaction and life satisfaction. Besides, Fung et al.,(2014) found that optimism and self-efficacy are related to work-life enrichment and job satisfaction.

**Resilience and Work-Family Enrichment**

As resilient people tend to be more self-confident, assertive, and have a positive affect (Ryff & Singer,2003), they are more positive about their job and life in general than those who are less resilient (Mak, Ng & Wong, 2011). Resilient people can also bounce back from stressful situations. Because of their resilience, in the light of Job Demands-Resources theory they would better be able to transfer and apply skills and new behaviours from work-to-family and family-to-work place.
Hope and Work-Family Enrichment

Individuals with high hope tend to be more affirmative with their goals and have strong determination to achieve them (Snyder, 2002; Peterson & Luthans, 2003). These people are also less anxious in stressful situations and are more adaptive to environmental change. They perceive blockages or problems at work as challenges and learning opportunities and are hopeful that problems can eventually be solved (Youssef & Luthans, 2007). They strive to achieve what they set out to accomplish even in difficult times and tend to find satisfaction in what they achieve (Froman, 2010). People with hopeful thinking are therefore more likely to feel positive about their job and to attain greater job satisfaction (Farran, Herth, & Popovich, 1995). According to Broaden and Build Theory, feelings lead to thoughts and thoughts turn to action. Thus, hopeful individuals are more likely to engage in work-life enrichment. The subsequent review examining PsyCap and work-family enrichment is taken from work-life literature.

The review of work-life literature shows there has been limited research assessing the influence of personality on enrichment (Boyar & Mosley, 2007; Michel & Clark, 2009). A few researchers have argued that personality or dispositional factors may be related to whether an individual experiences work-family conflict or work-family enrichment (Aminah & Noryati, 2011; Baral & Bhargava, 2011; Grzywacz & Butler, 2005; Sumer & Knight, 2001). The important role of personality variables in perceptions of enrichment has been noted amongst others by Friede and Ryan (2005).

In one of the initial attempts, Watson and Clark (1984) conducted a study and found that individuals high in negative affectivity that was measured by various tools like the Beck Depression Inventory, Eysenck Personality Inventory and the Multiple Affect Adjective Check List were more likely to experience discomfort across a variety of situations. It was suggested that individuals high in negative affectivity probably tend to focus on negative views of themselves and the world. These persons are more likely to experience work-family conflict as compared to persons low on negative affectivity.

Likewise, Carlson (1999) examined whether or not Type A personality and negative affectivity account for any variance in work-family conflict. She reported that individuals with Type A personality- “individuals who are ambitious, persistent, impatient and involved in their work”, and individuals high in negative affectivity “individuals who have a tendency to experience aversive emotional states” are more
likely to report work-family conflict than individuals without these dispositions” (p. 240).

In one of the important studies to look at this phenomenon, Sumer and Knight (2001) conducted a mail survey with 481 employees of United States Midwestern 29 universities and examined whether different attachment styles (i.e., secure, preoccupied, dismissing and fearful) are related to an individual’s experience of work-family conflict and work-family enrichment in both directions. The results suggest that individuals with a preoccupied attachment pattern (i.e., individuals with a negative image of themselves and positive image of others) were more likely to experience family-to-work conflict than individuals with secure attachment (i.e., individuals with a positive image for themselves and others) or dismissing attachment styles (i.e., individuals having a positive image of themselves but distrust and reject others). Securely attached individuals experienced more family-to-work enrichment than individuals who had a dismissing attachment style.

In another study, Wayne et al., (2004) examined personality as a factor contributing to the occurrence of work-family conflict and work-family enrichment. In their study, they examined the relationship between the Big Five personality traits (i.e., extraversion, neuroticism, conscientiousness, agreeableness and openness to experience) and work-family conflict and work-family enrichment. Extraversion predicted work-to-family enrichment and family-to–work enrichment but was not related to work-to-family conflict or family-to-work conflict. Conscientiousness and agreeableness were positively correlated with family-to-work enrichment but uncorrelated with work-to family enrichment. Neuroticism predicted work-family conflict in both directions but was not correlated with work-family enrichment in either direction. Higher conscientiousness was negatively related to work-to-family and family-to-work conflict.

Insights

The review indicated that personality factors and work-family enrichment is an understudied topic. There are few studies on PsyCap and its components being linked to work-family enrichment; but those which are reported show that they are associated with each other. This adds to the need for researches in this area which the present study has fulfilled. Besides, the researches on negative affectivity, attachment styles and five
factor factors can be seen to offer support to the hypothesized link between PsyCap and work-family enrichment.

2.6 PERCEIVED SOCIAL SUPPORT AND PSYCAP

The link between social support and PsyCap can be understood through theory as well as empirical studies.

Saks and Gruman (2011) in their theoretical paper linking organizational socialization and Positive Organisational Behaviour have discussed how socialization processes for new hires can enhance PsyCap and lead to positive organizational outcomes. They have based their assumptions on the Job Demands and Resources model which has been discussed earlier in the chapter. Social support is a job resource which influences people at the interpersonal level and as a group level. Supervisor social support and support from colleagues is associated with many positive work-related outcomes and is seen to reduce disengagement and burnout (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). Supervisor support also protects the employee from the harmful effects of job demands (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007). The relationships at work provide individuals with emotional support, advice, and help (Baker & Dutton, 2007), which are hypothesized to enhance all the constructs comprising PsyCap. For example, a supportive supervisor and coworkers are important sources of information and feedback that can improve self-efficacy. The new employee’s stress and anxiety can be reduced when he/she finds encouragement, help for the task assigned, and positive feedback. Social support is also functional for achieving work goals and can aid in the development of hope (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Supportive colleagues can also develop newcomers’ resilience by helping them overcome setbacks and difficulties; and make realistic attributions that ensure that the newcomers remain optimistic.

Drawing from the mentoring literature, it can be noted that as a high-quality connection, mentoring can promote the four dimensions of PsyCap (Ragins, 2007). Along these lines, meta-analyses demonstrate that mentoring is associated with individuals’ perception of promotion opportunities (Underhill, 2006) and the belief that they will advance in their careers (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004).
Another theoretical approach that can help link support with PsyCap is the social cognitive perspective. The construct of perceived support used in the present study draws from social cognitive theory. A premise from this theory is that once a person builds a stable belief about the support he/she will receive, it acts as a schema to think about any future demands of support. Therefore, as compared to those with low perceived support the ones who are high on perceived support interpret the same behaviors as more supportive, have better memory for supportive behaviors, display greater attention to supportive behaviors and are able to think of support with greater ease and speed (Baldwin 1992; Lakey & Cassady, 1990; Lakey & Drew, 1997). Also, negative thoughts of social relations overlap and stimulate negative thoughts about self leading to more emotional distress. Conversely, individuals high on perceived support would have positive thoughts of self making them feel happy. Perceived support is associated with strong self evaluations and self-esteem (Lakey & Cassady, 1990). High perceived social support can be hypothesized to be related to positive self-evaluation. The positive feelings about oneself would build confidence and self efficacy. Such a person would view the world in a more favorable way enhancing optimism and hope. Presence of others would enhance resilience.

Coming to the empirical studies, PsyCap, family emotional support and job satisfaction were found to be related to each other. All the domain components of PsyCap were associated with family emotional support and job satisfaction. However, family emotional support impacted job satisfaction through optimism and self efficacy in a study on 227 white-collar workers based in China (Kwok, Cheng, Wong, 2014). Social support in Chinese students was associated with PsyCap and subjective well-being. PsyCap was the mediator between social support and subjective well-being (Li et al., 2014). Besides, Liu, Hu, Wang, Sui and Ma (2013) probed the relation between perceived supervisor support, PsyCap and job performance amongst employees. Liu and her colleagues found significant correlations between the three variables. PsyCap was found to mediate the relation. In another study, supervisor social support was found to moderate the relationship between PsyCap and Job satisfaction (Naran, 2013). Social support network (family, friends, and others) was associated with PsyCap components of hope, optimism, self-efficacy, and resilience. Both support and the domains of PsyCap were found to be related to subjective well-being. To add, Social support was a moderator in the relation between positive states and well-being (Khan & Husain, 2010). The study was done on an Indian sample.
With respect to domains of PsyCap and their relationship to social support, there are studies which are in favor of the relationship. Resilience has been closely related to social support and help seeking behavior (Weidong et al., 2013). Strong evidence comes from the physiological perspective explaining the positive relation between social support and resilience; neuropeptide oxytocin released during social interactions helps to increase pro-social behaviour, trust and reduce anxiety (Ozbay et al., 2007).

Social support is also associated with optimism and is related to post traumatic growth (Schaefer & Moos, 1998). Social support is a key resource which helps a person adapt to the life events by influencing the coping style. It gives flexibility to coping strategy and hence is associated with optimism (Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004).

Social support is associated with self efficacy. Past research (e.g. Maddy, Cannon, & Lichterberger, 2015) has established this relation. Self efficacy has also been found to be associated with social support and well-being with optimism playing a role of mediator (Karademas, 2006). In the study, life satisfaction and depressive symptoms were taken as indicators of well-being. Social support was measured as daily emotional support. The emotional support led to enhancing of self efficacy as it provides positive encouragement, and enhanced feelings of self-esteem. Self efficacy was related to social support amongst female psychiatrist in China (Chun-Mei, Hai-Ying, & Hong-Mei, 2015).

Research relating social support and hope is scanty in the context of work-place. Most researches are from the rehabilitation and academic fields. In these studies, hope is related to social support. Hope as a construct is internally oriented and is stated to be less dependent on others. Yet, in a student population hope was seen to be related differentially to different types of social support. For the sample of rural students, instrumental social support was the sole predictor of hope. Whereas for students residing in the urban areas, hope was predicted by love and esteem related support, instrumental support and gender (Kemer & Atik, 2012).

**Insight**

Perceived social support and PsyCap are found in scarce empirical studies and therefore this gap in literature has been addressed in the present study. The hypothesized positive
association between the two variables is more based on theoretical foundation rather than empirical past findings.

2.7 PSYCAP AS A MEDIATOR

The mediating role of PsyCap signifies that perceived social support is causing PsyCap and PsyCap further causes work-family enrichment. A mediating effect is no doubt tested by multiple hierarchical regressions but social scientists call for a strong rationale for proposing the relationship. It is desirable to base it on theoretical foundations rather than only on empirical findings. Following this, the investigator has proposed three theoretical foundations at the start of the chapter from which the mediating role of PsyCap between perceived social support and work-family enrichment can be inferred.

Apart from the theoretical bases mentioned earlier, there are studies which identify PsyCap as a mediator when social support is a predictor. In one of the first studies in 2008, PsyCap played a mediating role in the relationship between supportive organizational climate and employee performance (Luthans, Norman, Avolio, & Avey, 2008). The authors explained this in the light of job demands and resource framework. Perceived social support is a job resource available in the outside social context. While work-life enrichment entails transfer of skills, resource and affect from one domain to another so as to enhance the other domain. Though research link between the two is strong, the conceptual link between the two may not be as simple and direct as some literature suggests. For an external factor to influence individual’s ability to transfer resources and experience gains in work and family domains, there may be an important role for a mediating variable that is specific to the individual. Hence, PsyCap can be the internal factor that leads to work-family enrichment from perceived social support.

Apart from the above-mentioned study, there is evidence from three more studies which have been already quoted in the context of social support and PsyCap in section 2.6. To sum up, the earlier mentioned studies, PsyCap was the mediator in the relation between family social support and job satisfaction (Kwok et al., 2014), social support and subjective well-being (Li, et al., 2014), perceived supervisor support and job performance (Liu et al., 2013).

A third indirect source of evidence comes from the studies where PsyCap is found as a mediator with other variables. The mediating effect of PsyCap was seen
between transformational leadership and followers’ job performance and satisfaction (Liu, Siu & Shi, 2010), between authentic leadership and work groups’ desired outcomes (Walumbwa, Luthans, Avey, & Oke, 2011), as well as between ethnic identity and the competence and growth aspects of job attributes performance (Combs, Milosevic, Jeung, & Griffith, 2012).

2.8 SUMMARY

The comprehensive review began with three theories which have given a strong foundation to this empirical study. The phenomenon of work-family enrichment has varied antecedents and consequences. Research evidence has shown that perceived social support is associated with work-family enrichment. Role of dispositional factors in work-family enrichment is understudied but theoretical backing for it exists and the studies warrant the inclusion of PsyCap in understanding work-family enrichment. Similarly, perceived social support and PsyCap link is strongly predicted by theory and empirical studies. Finally, the mediating role of PsyCap is supported through theory and empirical evidences.