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CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 OVERVIEW

Since the study followed the mixed methods sequential explanatory approach, the results and discussion pertain to quantitative as well as the qualitative data. The Chapter therefore initially consists of details pertaining to quantitative results and its discussion; and latter half of the chapter is devoted to qualitative results along with its discussion followed by synthesis, that is integration of both quantitative and qualitative data and its discussion.

The present chapter at the onset describes the sample characteristics and sampling distribution. Before carrying out further analyses, the data was screened for outliers and fulfillment of statistical assumptions which is described next. SPSS V20 was used for data analyses. Since there were two gender groups included in the sample, the gender difference on work-family enrichment was tested using independent samples t-test. The obtained results showed significant difference between male and female employees. So, further correlation analyses were carried out for male and female employees independently. The correlations results are elaborated. The hypothesis pertaining to mediation is tested using multiple hierarchical regressions and the results thereof are discussed. Additional analyses of gender difference and the correlational results with demographical variables with the variables under study are also explored.

The qualitative study begins with the identification of central themes and its domains. The themes are described extensively using representative quotes of the participants. This is followed by the discussion of qualitative data. The chapter concludes with the integration of both quantitative and qualitative findings.
### 4.2 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

This section presents the mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis values and their standard errors, for the variables used in the present study.

**Table 4.1:** Mean, SD, SEM, Skewness, Std. Error of Skewness, Kurtosis, Std. Error of Kurtosis for Variables Under Study (n = 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Std. Error of Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Std. Error of Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>125.27</td>
<td>8.330</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>121.59</td>
<td>7.635</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>-.525</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.339</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.41</td>
<td>2.533</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.529</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.99</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>-.713</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.26</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>-.231</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.321</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.60</td>
<td>2.174</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.677</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>2.247</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td>1.932</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.347</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.96</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.18</td>
<td>1.977</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-.365</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.483</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFE</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>3.301</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35.57</td>
<td>2.301</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-1.069</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFD</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.416</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.614</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>Std. Error of Kurtosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWE</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.22</td>
<td>2.842</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35.75</td>
<td>2.101</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWD</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.409</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.469</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.625</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.509</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWEF</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.494</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-1.131</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58.19</td>
<td>8.457</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74.09</td>
<td>6.102</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.375</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>127.2</td>
<td>8.827</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>-.379</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>126.8</td>
<td>7.498</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>-.496</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.308</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key for the table 4.1:

PsyCap = Psychological Capital
WFE = Work-to-family Enrichment
WFD = Work-to-family Development
WFA = Work-to-family Affect
WFC = Work-to-family Capital
FWE = Family-to-work Enrichment
FWD = Family-to-work Development
FWA = Family-to-work Affect
FWEF = Family-to-work Efficiency
SSA = Perceived Social Support Availability
SSS = Perceived Social Support Satisfaction
4.3 ASSUMPTION TESTING

Every statistical test comes with its set of assumptions which need to be met before using the test for data analyses. The following section describes in detail the procedure used for assumption testing.

4.3.1 Screening for Outliers and Treatment

According to Barnet and Lewis (1994), an outlying observation or outlier, is one that appears to deviate markedly from other members of the sample in which it occurs. Undetected outliers can lead to model misspecification, biased parameter estimation and incorrect results. It is therefore important to identify them prior to modeling and analysis (Liu, Shah & Jiang, 2004; Williams, Baxter, He, Hawkins & Gu, 2002). For the present study, outliers were calculated based on the z scores. The z scores for each variable were computed and the cut-off point of $\pm 3z$ was adopted to identify outlier/s (Field, 2009). Literature has reported several ways to deal with outliers (Osborne & Overbay, 2004). It recommends deletion of outliers or transformation of data. Deletion is generally used when the score is an error of data entry or does not fit sample criteria or is missing at random values (Garson, 2012). Since none of the above was the case, deletion was not employed. Data transformation was ruled out since when transformation method is applied to entire data irrespective of whether the variable is skewed or not, it makes data interpretation complex. In the present study, the method of case replacement was employed, which replaces the outlier raw score with the score closest to non-outlying value based on z scores (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1989). While doing these analyses, the two hope scores in men – i.e. case 17, $z = -4.26$, $X = 22$ and case 105, $z = -3.86$, $X = 24$; were modified as 26 and 27, respectively for ‘Reducing the influence of outliers’ following Tabachnik and Fidell (1989, pp 70), since the lowest non-outlying value for hope was $X = 28$. Similarly, there were two replacements for PsyCap in women – i.e. case 112, $z = 4.14$, $X$ (raw score) = 140 and case 7, $z = 3.50$, $X = 138$; were modified as 132 and 131, respectively as the highest non-outlying value for PsyCap was $X = 130$. This modification, while reducing the influence of outliers, did not eliminate outlying cases completely and maintained the natural order of all cases.
4.3.2 Sample size

Adequacy of the sample size was ascertained based on the guidelines given by Cohen (1992). A sample of 300 employees was used in the present research, that exceeds the sample size of 177 as recommended for medium effect size at $\alpha = .05$ level. Besides, Tabachnik and Fidell (2007, p.123) have suggested the formula: $n > 50 + 8 \times (k)$ where ‘k’ is number of predictors in the regression model. The sample size of 300 taken in the present research is far larger than the one derived from this formula (50+8x7 = 98).

4.3.3 Normality of distribution:

In social sciences researches, the assumption of normality is considered of prime importance. Though exact normality cannot be achieved but the approximation of normality is expected. Table 1 of descriptive statistics shows the skewness, and kurtosis. Majority of the variables follow normal distribution with skewness and kurtosis lying within the range of +1 to -1. The visual methods too were employed like the Normal Distribution Curve (NDC) and Normal P-P graph which indicate normality (refer Appendix D and E).

4.3.4 Homoscedasticity

Another important assumption is of homoscedasticity, i.e. equal variances of errors across all levels of IVs. This was checked by plotting standardized residuals by the standardized predicted values (Osborne & Waters, 2002) (refer Appendix F)

4.3.5 Multicollinearity

The assumption related to multicollinearity, says that the IVs should not be as much correlated with each other as they are correlated with the DV. For testing this assumption, the tolerance and Variance Inflation ratio was inspected. The tolerance was closer to .1 and VIF was less than 10. Statisticians like Kenny (2016) state that multicollinearity is to be expected for mediation analyses. In the present study as stated above the tolerance and VIF was in the acceptable range.
4.4 QUANTITATIVE STUDY

The present sample though homogenous on all criteria, differed on the aspect of gender. It comprised of two distinct sub groups namely males and females. Bewick, Cheek and Ball (2003) have stated that presence of sub groups could result in clusters of points leading to an inflated correlation coefficient. Therefore, to verify whether the two groups truly differed on the dependent variable (DV) of work-family enrichment, independent samples t-test was carried out.

Table 4.2: Summary of Results of Independent Samples t-test comparing Males and Females on Work-to-family Enrichment and Family-to-Work Enrichment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-Family Enrichment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35.57</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-to-Work Enrichment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.22</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35.75</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the t test indicated that the means of the two groups were significantly different on work-to-family enrichment ($t = 3.77$, $p < 0.01$) and family-to-work enrichment ($t = 5.31$, $p < 0.01$). Therefore, it was deemed necessary to run the correlation analyses separately for males and females, and test the hypotheses. Gender differences on the variables under study are discussed later in section 4.4.3

4.4.1 Correlation Analyses

Pearson’s Product Moment correlation was computed for the variables under study. The correlation coefficients for males and females are presented separately.
Table 4.3: Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficients showing Relationship between Perceived Social Support, and PsyCap for Males (n = 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>PsyCap</th>
<th>Hope</th>
<th>Efficacy</th>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>Optimism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>availability</td>
<td>.204**</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td>.185*</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived satisfaction with Social Support</td>
<td>.530**</td>
<td>.429**</td>
<td>434**</td>
<td>.410**</td>
<td>.472 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01

The correlation coefficients with their alpha values in the above table indicate that hypothesis 1 stating perceived social support, i.e. (a) availability of support and (b) satisfaction with support, is positively and significantly related to PsyCap for male employees is accepted except for the domain of hope and optimism.

Table 4.4: Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficients showing Relationship between Perceived Social Support, and the PsyCap for Females (n = 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>PsyCap</th>
<th>Hope</th>
<th>Efficacy</th>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>Optimism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>availability</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.136*</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.137*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived satisfaction with Social Support</td>
<td>.566**</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>.571**</td>
<td>.444**</td>
<td>.415**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01

The correlation coefficients with their alpha values in the above table indicate that hypothesis 2 stating perceived social support, i.e. (a) availability of support and (b) satisfaction with support, is positively and significantly related to PsyCap for female employees is accepted for availability of support and the domains of efficacy and optimism. It is also accepted with respect to satisfaction with support and PsyCap and all its four domains. While the hypothesized relation between availability of support and PsyCap, hope and resilience for females stands rejected.
Evaluating Hypotheses 1 and 2:

The present finding indicates that majorly perceived social support is positively associated with PsyCap and in its domains. Perceived social support availability was associated with PsyCap ($r = .204, p < .01$), Efficacy ($r = .224, p < .01$), and Resilience ($r = .185, p < .05$) in men. In women, perceived social support availability was significantly related to efficacy ($r = .136, p < .05$) and optimism ($r = .137, p < .05$). Perceived social support satisfaction is positively associated with PsyCap ($r = .530, p < .01$) as well its domains namely hope ($r = .429, p < .01$), efficacy ($r = .434, p < .01$), resilience ($r = .410, p < .01$) and optimism ($r = .472, p < .01$) in men (refer table 4.3); whereas for female employees, perceived social support satisfaction is positively associated with PsyCap ($r = .566, p < .01$) as well its domains namely efficacy ($r = .571, p < .01$), hope ($r = .396, p < .01$), resilience ($r = .444, p < .01$) and optimism ($r = .415, p < .01$)(refer table 4.4).

The perceived social support tool for this study measures structural support in terms of number of support sources available as well as adequacy of support in the form of satisfaction expressed with the support. Multiple sources of support from both work as well as non-work domains like supervisor, coworkers, spouse, family, and friends can be termed as an important resource for an individual. Satisfaction with the support is an added dimension which explains the value placed on the support available. In recent literature on social support, there is an emphasis being placed on perceived support quality and the responsiveness of caregiver as determining factors for social support to be beneficial (e.g. Maisel & Gable, 2009; Rini, Dunkel-Schetter, Hobel, Glynn, & Sandman, 2006). The present finding is in line with this trend.

Having strong support systems has been previously found to be related to various work outcomes like organizational commitment, job satisfaction (Mercer & Bilson, 1985 as cited from Luthans et al., 2008) and customer satisfaction (Rogg, Schmidt, Shull, & Schmitt, 2001). In this study, it has been found to be related to personal level resources of PsyCap.

This can be supported in varied ways. Firstly, as explained earlier in the second chapter, the social cognitive theorists (Lakey & Cassady, 1990) state that higher amounts of social support enhance positive self evaluations leading to positive emotions. Broaden and Build theory (Fredickson, 1998, 2001) explains that these...
positive emotions enable individuals to have wider cognitions and erase the effect of negative arousal (Youssef & Luthans, 2007; Wright, 2005). It increases their resilience (Tugade & Fredrickson, 2002) and over time helps build other personal resources like self-efficacy, hope and optimism even in the face of adversity (Fredrickson & Joiner, 2002, Fredrickson, 2013). Thus, through experiences of positive emotions, persons can transform into creative, wise and socially well accepted individuals which are termed as a state of flourishing (Fredrickson & Kurtz, 2011).

From the perspective of the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 2001), the relationships that people value can be viewed as a resource. According to the COR tenets a resource is not just maintained and guarded against loss but it helps to acquire more new resources. Therefore, the relationships or social support act as a resource which leads to gaining new resources like the psychological strengths of self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience (Avey, Luthans & Youssef, 2010). To explain it further, self-efficacy is a component of core self evaluations and is closely associated with self-esteem. Employees perceiving many sources of support will benefit from the different types of information, suggestions or feedback that they will have access to, for example the supervisor may provide feedback of the progress on the job while a coworker might share information on how to deal with the boss while another friend inspires him to put in more effort. This is likely to increase the employee’s belief that he/she can be successful at the task. Reporting to be satisfied with the available sources gives an added advantage of feeling loved and valued further enhancing one’s self-esteem. Enhancement of self-esteem results into more self-efficacy. According to Bovier, Chamot and Perneger (2004) support from others also reinforces individual’s sense of mastery which again is an attribute of a self-efficacious person. Thus, supportive colleagues and supervisor help build the resource of self-efficacy. Addition of each new capacity leads to a resource gain spiral consequently building a stronger pool of resources or resource reservoir.

On the other hand, the Job Demands and Resource theory (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) posits that job resources are 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. Hence social support is a job resource (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) that helps develop employee strengths in two ways. Firstly, by reducing job strain and so employee is more
engaged in the job which will aid new learning and secondly by motivating employees towards personal growth by developing new skills or capacities. Therefore, having adequate support (job resource) will make a person efficacious, hopeful, resilient and optimistic which are called personal resources (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009). For example, Resilience is the adaptive capacity in a person to face the stressful situation and bounce back in the face of adversity (Luthans et al., 2006). Resilience is reactive in a sense that it is a response to stressful situations. Presence of a support system provides a safety net where a person can develop pathways to cope with adversity. When an individual perceives strong support, he is more likely to evaluate the stressor as a challenge which can be dealt with successfully rather than a threat he or she has to run away from. It allows a person to be calm and focused in stressful environment thus developing personal resource of resilience in him or her.

Lastly, the association between social support and PsyCap can be understood from the Attachment Theory proposed by Bowlby (1969). This theory was originally tested with infants and found that infants whose caregivers were responsive to their needs showed secure attachment style. Such infants were more confident and explored their surroundings to a greater extent (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978). This theory in the recent times has caught the attention of social scientists (Cacioppo & Patrick, 2008; Coan, 2008, 2010), who have demonstrated that the attachment style is stable and exists even in adults. An adult who has strong and satisfying relationships with any person is seen to benefit from it (Tooby & Cosmides, 1996). These relationships not just act as a space for comfort during distress (Collins & Feeney, 2000; Simpson, Rholes & Nelligan, 1992) but also promote exploration of self and personal growth (Feeney, 2004). Perceived support that is of high quality helps to make a person autonomous, resilient and adopt an optimistic attribution style and makes him hopeful. This has support from the mentoring studies (Underhill, 2006), which show that having a trustworthy, competent mentor is beneficial.

Inspite of such strong evidence supporting perceived social support to be associated with PsyCap and its domains, there are deviation from expected results. A close inspection shows that support satisfaction is strongly associated with PsyCap and all its domains in both genders. The perceived availability of support was not found to be associated with PsyCap in women ($r = .111, p > .05$), hope in both genders ($r = .124, p > .05$; $r = .061, p > .05$ for men and women respectively), resilience in
women ($r = .071, p > .05$) and optimism in men ($r = .131, p > .05$). This is explained in the following ways.

As discussed earlier, social support is a multidimensional construct with complex mechanisms which leads many times to unexpected findings as revealed in the context of structural support. For example, Buunk and Hoorens, (1992) have reported that a high level of social support at work is associated with a high level of stress and/or a low level of health and well-being among employees. Such counter intuitive results do exist especially when the design is correlation rather than experimental.

Next, the lack of association between social support availability and PsyCap (women) can be understood in the light of socio-cultural factors as recommended by Oyserman, Coon and Kemmelmeier in 2002. The female employees in the present sample are working mothers with a mean age of 38. The time needed to build social networks and maintain the old ones may not be freely available at their disposal and building social relationships cost time and energy (Ray & Miller, 1994). This may have a limiting effect on the development of PsyCap. Apart from that, Reevy and Maslach (2001) have reported that the feminine gender tends to seek and receive support from the same gender. In the context of the present study, 70% of the women employees belonged to the manufacturing sector where the presence of males is higher and therefore might have male boss or colleagues. Thus, they may not leverage those social support sources. Another, plausible reason is related to the fact that women tend to know a lot of people due to their emotional expressiveness but this also makes them prone to carry other people’s distress to their own lives. This may cause them to worry or ruminate over issues (O’Neil, 1991). This can reduce the value of multiple sources as a resource. Therefore, it may be unrelated to development of PsyCap.

In addition, recent researches in social support strongly emphasize that mere presence of support is not enough (e.g. Kane, McCall, Collins & Blascovich, 2012). In their experiment, Kane and his colleagues, found that in a virtual cliff walk activity (threatening activity) when the partner was responsive, the participant evaluated the task as challenging, felt less stressful, more secure and could focus on the task. While those participants who had, unresponsive partners viewed the task as more stressful, felt less secure and spent more time gazing at the partner for reassurance. Their performance was similar to those who did the activity alone. Rini et al., (2006) and Feeny and Collins, (2014) argue that the benefits of support can be drawn only if it is responsive and
sensitive. Responsiveness refers to the support giver’s ability of being unreservedly available and supporting quickly. While sensitivity refers to matching the provided support to the receiver’s need.

This can be one of the reasons in finding no significant relation between social support and the domains of hope, resilience and optimism. To elaborate further, hope entails the perception that one’s goals can be met. It denotes both will power and the ability to have different strategies. This capacity may be least dependent on mere presence of support sources. Simply having larger support network may not be enhancing the hope capacity.

Similarly, resilience is the adaptive capacity in a person to face the stressful situation and as Luthans et al., (2006) added is the capacity to bounce back and beyond in the face of adverse or challenging situation. Dunkel-Schetter and Bennett (1990) argue that members of one’s social network are not always responsive when needed or sometimes have difficulty in providing effective support under stressful circumstances. Network members may also feel threatened by the situation and feel uncertain about the most effective way to help. Simply having multiple sources may not help and the employees might experience more amount of stress if the network is unsupportive (Seeman & Berkman, 1988 as cited from Turner-Cobb et al., 2004).

Besides, social network many times consist of non-voluntary ties that may not be functional in a supportive role. In the context of optimism; an optimist expects positive outcomes as compared to pessimist; and attributes success to stable internal factors rather than external factors. Having coworkers or supervisors who do not behave in a functionally supportive manner will not enhance optimism. Earlier studies have pointed to the fact that nature of relationship affects the effectiveness of social support (For example Kaufmann & Beehr, 1989; Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002). Therefore, large or small network characterised by poor relations will not be associated with optimism. With the present sample, this aspect needed to be probed which was possible in the qualitative data analysis which is explained in the subsequent section.

To summarize, perceived availability of social support has been found to be associated with PsyCap and majority of its domains and not being associated a few domains. But, satisfaction with support is found to enhance PsyCap and its domains in unequivocal terms.
Social Support and Work–family Enrichment

Table 4.5: Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficients showing Relationship between Perceived Social Support, and the Work-to-Family Enrichment for Males (n = 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Enrichment</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Development</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Affect</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support availability</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived satisfaction with Social Support</td>
<td>.370**</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>.395**</td>
<td>.356**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

The correlation coefficients with their alpha values in the above table indicate that hypothesis 3 stating that Perceived Social support, i.e. (a) availability of support and (b) satisfaction with support is positively and significantly related to work-to-family enrichment for male employees, is partially accepted; for male employees only perceived satisfaction with social support is significantly related to family enrichment and its domains, whereas perceived availability of social support is not.

Table 4.6: Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficients showing Relationship between Perceived Social Support, and the Work-to-Family Enrichment for Females (n = 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Enrichment</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Development</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Affect</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support availability</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived satisfaction with Social Support</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.419**</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.304**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
The correlation coefficients with their alpha values in the above table indicate that hypothesis 4 stating that Perceived Social support i.e. (a) availability of support and (b) satisfaction with support is positively and significantly related to work-to-family enrichment for female employees is partially accepted; the results are similar to those for male employees.

*Evaluating Hypotheses 3 and 4:*

Perceived social support satisfaction was significantly associated with work-to-family \( (r = .370, p < .01) \), work-to-family development \( (r = .384, p < .01) \), work-to-family affect \( (r = .395, p < .05) \) and work-to-family capital \( r = .356, p < .01 \) in men (refer Table 4.5).

Perceived social support satisfaction was significantly associated with work-to-family enrichment \( (r = .287, p < .01) \), work-to-family development \( (r = .419, p < .01) \), work-to-family affect \( (r = .322, p < .01) \) and work-to-family capital \( r = .304 p < .01 \) in women (refer Table 4.6). The results indicate that perceived satisfaction of support is significantly associated with work-family enrichment and its domains in both genders.

The investigator believes that the value of social support is not just in times of adversity but it has a crucial role to play in promoting human excellence and well-being. To explain the significant association of perceived social support satisfaction with work-to-family enrichment the Self Determination Theory (SDT) of Deci and Ryan (2000) is found to be apt.

According to this theory, there are three fundamental psychological needs in humans which they strive to meet. These needs are identified as need to achieve autonomy, need to be competent and need for relatedness. Need for relatedness refers to having close relationships and a sense of belongingness. These needs are similar to the needs proposed by early need theorists like Maslow (1943) though SDT does not agree with the hierarchy of needs. It posits that individuals strive to meet all needs by engaging in interesting activities in socially meaningful context (Deci & Ryan, 2000). According to these authors when these needs are fulfilled it leads to self-realization and psychological well-being.

The Greenhaus and Powel model (2006) of work-family enrichment (described in the first chapter) is a bidirectional model. For work-family enrichment to occur they
have stated that the resources of flexibility, material resources, social capital resources, psychological and physical skills, and perspectives (i.e. respecting differences) need to be generated at the work place due to role participation and these should be further transferred to the family domain to improve the quality of life in that domain.

The present tool (Carlson et al., 2006) measures work-to-family enrichment in terms of work-to-family development, affect and capital. Development refers to acquisition or refinement of skills, knowledge, behaviours or viewing things at work that help the individual to be a better family person. Affect is a positive emotional state or attitude which results at work which helps the employee be a better family member. Capital refers to work enhancing psycho-social resources like self-esteem, confidence, sense of security that helps the employee be a better family member.

Drawing from the SDT theory, in the context of the present study, the supportive climate can be hypothesized to help to satisfy the basic needs of the employee so that they will be in optimum health and psychological state of well-being. Hence, they will be able to generate and transfer the resources from work place to family domain leading to work-to-family enrichment. In other words, the satisfaction of the three needs due to the supportive climate perceived by the employees can lead to work-to-family development, affect and capital. This inference could be drawn from following empirical evidences.

Extant literature shows a strong association between social support and need satisfaction and furthermore in these studies the mediating role of need satisfaction was also established. Needs satisfaction was identified as a mediator between supportive climate and involvement (Gagne´, 2003; Deci et al., 2001), adjustment (Baard,Deci, & Ryan, 2004) and self-esteem (Deci et al., 2001). In addition, there are studies which identify the consequences of need satisfaction. Empirical studies of Illardi, Leone, Kasser and Ryan (1993) as well as of Van den Broeck, Vansteenkiste, De Witte and Lens, (2008) have shown satisfaction of the needs to be positively associated with self-esteem, well-being, and vigor. It is also found related to lower levels of emotional exhaustion (Van den Broeck et al., 2008) too.

In sum, it can be concluded that satisfying relationships lead to positive outcomes for the employee at the work place which generate varied resources like self-esteem, vigor which can be transferred to the family domain through the affective path
and the involvement at work can lead to job satisfaction and other perks from the organizations like material resources which can be transferred to the family through the instrumental path (Greenhaus & Powel, 2006). Thus, work-to-family enrichment can occur successfully.

Perceived social support availability was not significantly associated with work-to-family (r = .084, p > .05), work-to-family development (r = .045, p > .05), work-to-family affect (r = .093, p > .05) and work-to-family capital (r = .110, p > .05) in men. Perceived social support availability was not significantly associated with work-to-family (r = .094, p > .05), work-to-family development (r = .034, p > .05), work-to-family affect (r = .107, p > .05) and work-to-family capital (r = .122, p > .05) in women, too. After revisiting the extant literature, quite a few plausible reasons could be identified for the rejection of hypotheses. The plausible reasons cited in the earlier section on the discussion between social support availability and PsyCap could be applicable here too.

Apart from those that were quoted, a few more can be added. Network size does not give a clue of the type of support exchanged or its nature. Therefore, certain plausible ideas can be put forth: As stated previously, social support researches have shown inconsistencies in findings in the past, too. Aryee etal., (2005) found lack of association between social support and work-family balance where the sources of support were not categorized into their types. An employee may not seek support because he or she may perceive a negative attitude towards receiving support in his or her organization (Stephens & Long, 2000). Sometimes support may not be sought as it makes an individual look less competent and more dependent adversely affecting his self-esteem (Wong & Cheuk, 2000). Another interesting fact of support is that if a person receives aid that is not helpful it results in him or her experiencing feelings of helplessness (Frese, 1999) and discourages him or her from seeking help later. Finally, recent researches have indicated that a match in the values of the employee and supervisor is important in the positive experience of Work-family interface (Thompson, Brough & Schmidt, 2006). Mere presence of social support in peoples’ lives may not always be related to work-family enrichment. Perceived support is a cognitive construct and the above-mentioned processes may have lowered its value as a valuable psychological resource in the work-family enrichment phenomenon.
Table 4.7: Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficients showing Relationship between Perceived Social Support, and the Family-to-Work Enrichment for Males (n = 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Family-Work Enrichment</th>
<th>Family to Work Development</th>
<th>Family to Work Affect</th>
<th>Family to Work Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support availability</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived satisfaction with Social Support</td>
<td>.496**</td>
<td>.394**</td>
<td>.311**</td>
<td>.426**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

The correlation coefficients with their alpha values in the above table indicate that hypothesis 5 stating that perceived social support, i.e. (a) availability of support and (b) satisfaction with support, is positively and significantly related to family-to-work enrichment for male employees, is accepted for the satisfaction with support but rejected for availability of support.

Table 4.8: Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficients showing Relationship between Perceived Social Support, and the Family-to-Work Enrichment for Females (n = 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Family-to-Work Enrichment</th>
<th>Family-to-Work Development</th>
<th>Family-to-Work Affect</th>
<th>Family-to-Work Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support availability</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived satisfaction with Social Support</td>
<td>.383**</td>
<td>.213**</td>
<td>.360**</td>
<td>.358**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

The correlation coefficients with their alpha values in the above table indicate that hypothesis 6 stating that perceived social support i.e. (a) availability of support and (b) satisfaction with support is positively and significantly related to family-to-work
enrichment for female employees is accepted for the satisfaction with support but rejected for availability of support.

*Evaluating Hypotheses 5 and 6:*

Perceived social support satisfaction was significantly associated with family-to-work enrichment \( (r = .496, p < .01) \), family-to-work development \( (r = .394, p < .01) \), family-to-work affect \( (r = .311, p < .01) \) and family-to-work efficiency \( (r = .426, p < .01) \) in men (refer Table 4.7).

Perceived social support satisfaction was significantly associated with work-to-family-to-work enrichment \( (r = .383, p < .01) \), family-to-work development \( (r = .213, p < .01) \), family-to-work affect \( (r = .360, p < .01) \) and family-to-work efficiency \( (r = .358, p < .01) \) in women (refer Table 4.8).

Family-to-work enrichment entails family-to-work development, affect and efficiency. Development refers to acquisition or refinement of skills, knowledge, behaviours or viewing things at family that help the individual to be a better employee. Affect is a positive emotional state or attitude which results at family which helps the family member to be a better employee. Efficiency occurs when involvement with family provides a sense of focus or urgency which helps the individual to be a better worker (Carlson *et al.*, 2007).

Family allows for a lot of opportunity of social capitalization. It refers to sharing of positive information with others (Langston, 1994). When individuals can hold the enthusiasm of the other person when he shares information of success or accomplishment it enhances the positive feelings in the other person independent of the positive event (Gable, Reis, Impett, & Asher, 2004). Having supportive relationships helps to develop his or her self-esteem (Leary, 2005). Also, children enhance personal joy and teach various skills and perspective. Research indicates working fathers have higher family-to-work enrichment than unmarried men (Grywacyz & Marks, 2000). Also, women who do not have family burden or do not face criticism at home are more likely to have better family-to-work enrichment (Grywacyz & Marks, 2000).

Frone, (2003) had asserted that social support is the important antecedent of Work-family enrichment. Meta analytic study of McNall, Nicklin and Masuda (2009) found that social support leads to increase in satisfaction levels in the same domain. For
example, family support leads to family satisfaction and leads to increased effort in the work domain especially in collectivistic country like India (Grywacyz & Marks, 2000). Family supports an individual by providing advice, love, and motivates them to work harder at work (Yeh, Arora, & Wu, 2006). Mauno and Rantanen (2012) reported that social support as a contextual factor helped in work-family enrichment.

These empirical studies can be understood in the context of Broaden and build theory of Fredrickson (1998, 2001). Adequate support from the family leads to satisfaction with the family life. Such a person is more likely to be in a positive state of emotion. These emotions over a period can be consolidated and leads to making a person more creative at problem solving, knowledgeable and socially integrated (Fredrickson& Kurtz, 2011). A person high on the positive qualities is able to improve the quality of family life and due to positive family-to-work spillover will be a better employee (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000).

Once again social support availability was not related to family-to-work enrichment. Perceived social support availability was not significantly associated with family-to-work enrichment ($r = .131$, $p > .05$), family-to-work development ($r = .034$, $p > .05$), family-to-work affect ($r = .181$, $p > .05$) and family-to-work efficiency($r = .181$, $p > .05$) in men (refer Table 4.7). Also, Perceived social support availability was not significantly associated with family-to-work enrichment ($r = .130$, $p > .05$), family-to-work development ($r = .087$, $p > .05$), family-to-work affect ($r = .076$, $p > .05$) and family-to-work efficiency ($r = .122$, $p > .05$) in women (Refer Table 4.8).

The plausible reasons given in the explanation for work-to-family enrichment can be further added to: Firstly, as noted by Rajadhyaksha and Smita (2004), there is lack of institutionalized support especially in India; employees have to rely on support that is unpaid and many a times from the unorganized sector that may be unreliable. In this situation, immediate family is looked upon as an important source of support. The other forms of support sources available are supervisor or colleagues. These sources may offer support but there may be also a cost attached to it in terms of reciprocity which may outweigh the benefits they bring (Nahum-Shani, Bamberger, & Bacharach, 2011). Secondly, there may not be a match between the support sought and support received. These could possibly explain why perceived social support in terms of size was not associated with family-to-work enrichment.
PsyCap and work–family enrichment

Table 4.9: Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficients showing Relationship between PsyCap, and the Work-to-Family-Enrichment for Males (n = 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Enrichment</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Development</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Affect</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>.632**</td>
<td>.567**</td>
<td>.642**</td>
<td>.625**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.504**</td>
<td>.473**</td>
<td>.554**</td>
<td>.555**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.461**</td>
<td>.430**</td>
<td>.502**</td>
<td>.516**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>.504**</td>
<td>.546**</td>
<td>.627**</td>
<td>.593**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>.576**</td>
<td>.582**</td>
<td>.418**</td>
<td>.336**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

The correlation coefficients with their alpha values in the above table indicate that hypothesis 7 stating that PsyCap will be positively and significantly related to work-to-family enrichment for male employees is accepted.

Table 4.10: Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficients showing Relationship between PsyCap, and the Work-to-family Enrichment for Females (n = 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Enrichment</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Development</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Affect</th>
<th>Work-to-Family Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>.675**</td>
<td>.775**</td>
<td>.653**</td>
<td>.696**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.548**</td>
<td>.697**</td>
<td>.502**</td>
<td>.608**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.543**</td>
<td>.628**</td>
<td>.559**</td>
<td>.525**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>.587**</td>
<td>.711**</td>
<td>.594**</td>
<td>.590**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>.624**</td>
<td>.685**</td>
<td>.564**</td>
<td>.587**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
The correlation coefficients with their alpha values in the above table indicate that hypothesis 8 stating that PsyCap will be positively and significantly related to work-to-family enrichment for female employees is accepted.

**Evaluating Hypotheses 7 and 8:**

PsyCap is significantly associated with work-to-family enrichment \( (r = .632, p < .01) \), work-to-family development \( (r = .567, p < .01) \), work-to-family affect \( (r = .642, p < .01) \) and work-to-family capital \( (r = .625, p < .01) \) in men (refer Table 4.9). And PsyCap is significantly associated with work-to-family enrichment \( (r = .675, p < .01) \), work-to-family development \( (r = .775, p < .01) \), work-to-family affect \( (r = .653, p < .01) \) and work-to-family capital \( (r = .696, p < .01) \) in women (refer Table 4.10).

Hope is significantly associated with work-to-family enrichment \( (r = .504, p < .01) \), work-to-family development \( (r = .473, p < .01) \), work-to-family affect \( (r = .554, p < .01) \) and work-to-family capital \( (r = .555, p < .01) \) in men (refer Table 4.9). And hope is significantly associated with work-to-family enrichment \( (r = .548, p < .01) \), work-to-family development \( (r = .697, p < .01) \), work-to-family affect \( (r = .502, p < .01) \) and work-to-family capital \( (r = .608, p < .01) \) in women (refer Table 4.10).

Efficacy is significantly associated with work-to-family enrichment \( (r = .461, p < .01) \), work-to-family development \( (r = .430, p < .01) \), work-to-family affect \( (r = .502, p < .01) \) and work-to-family capital \( (r = .516, p < .01) \) in men (refer Table 4.9). Whereas for women, efficacy is significantly associated with work-to-family enrichment \( (r = .543, p < .01) \), work-to-family development \( (r = .628, p < .01) \), work-to-family affect \( (r = .559, p < .01) \) and work-to-family capital \( (r = .525, p < .01) \) (refer Table 4.10).

Resilience is significantly associated with work-to-family enrichment \( (r = .504, p < .01) \), work-to-family development \( (r = .546, p < .01) \), work-to-family affect \( (r = .627, p < .01) \) and work-to-family capital \( (r = .593, p < .01) \) in men (refer Table 4.9). And Resilience is significantly associated with work-to-family enrichment \( (r = .587, p < .01) \), work-to-family development \( (r = .711, p < .01) \), work-to-family
affect \( (r = .594, p < .01) \) and work-to-family capital \( (r = .590, p < .01) \) in women (refer Table 4.10).

Optimism is significantly associated with work-to-family enrichment \( (r = .576, p < .01) \), work-to-family development \( (r = .582, p < .01) \), work-to-family affect \( (r = .418, p < .01) \) and work-to-family capital \( (r = .336, p < .01) \) in men (refer Table 4.9). And Optimism is significantly associated with work-to-family enrichment \( (r = .624, p < .01) \), work-to-family development \( (r = .685, p < .01) \), work-to-family affect \( (r = .564, p < .01) \) and work-to-family capital \( (r = .587, p < .01) \) in women (refer Table 4.10).

This study is unique in its contribution as the results show a significant positive association of PsyCap with work-to-family enrichment and family-to-work enrichment and its domains. The findings can be explained with the help of Conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 2002).

PsyCap can be viewed as the personal characteristic which acts as a resource with high levels of PsyCap resulting in better health and wellbeing. PsyCap comprises of self-efficacy, hope, resilience and optimism. The personal resources help an individual protect him or her from the harmful effects of job demands (Lu, Siu, Chen, & Wang, 2011) helps to maintain their health and well-being (Avey, Luthans & Youssef, 2010) even in the face of stress (Bonanno, 2004; Avey, Luthans, &Jensen, 2009). Avey and his colleagues have found PsyCap to be linked to Health and Wellbeing indicators like psychological well-being and physical health as measured by General Health questionnaire (2009). Its association to family domain is not so widely studied yet it can be understood in the following manner.

Self-efficacy in PsyCap is a resource which reduces the impact of stressors and multiple job demands (Bandura and Locke, 2003). It also enhances confidence and self-esteem. Optimism of PsyCap makes a person attribute success to stable internal characteristics while setback is attributed to external causes. This makes a person believe that he will be able to achieve goals even in adverse situations now and in future (Luthans et al., 2007). The optimism is realistic and flexible hence is more beneficial to the person. Hope is a resource as it consists of a person’s motivation to succeed at a task and his or her ability to derive different pathways to achieve the task in the face of adversity (Synder, 2002; Luthans et al., 2007). Resilience helps a person not just cope
with stress effectively but also helps him or her to develop from it (rebound) (Luthans, Vogelgesang, & Lester, 2006). A person high on these resources has been found to cope better with difficult situations, occupational stress, showed better performance, experiences work engagement and job satisfaction. This is supportive of the COR theory that believes resources help to build resources and prevents loss of existing resources.

An individual who is high on PsyCap would be able to manage the demands of both work and family domain successfully as he is likely to perceive them as challenges that can be met than as threats (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Van Steenbergen, Ellemers, Haslam, & Urlings, 2008). Since he will be able to meet the demands it will make him experience control over his life and give him a sense of mastery (Bovier et al., 2004). This will broaden his view and he will in turn feel capable of pooling resources and transferring them to both domains (Siu et al., 2013) achieving work-to-family enrichment.

This is in line with Greenhaus and Powell model of work-family enrichment (2006). The above-mentioned resources like work engagement, self-esteem etc. that are generated by PsyCap could be classified as work development (new behaviour, perspectives, skills developed at work) affect (positive emotional state and attitude gained at work) capital (when involvement in work promotes levels of psycho-social resources such as a sense of security, confidence, accomplishment, or self-fulfillment that helps the individual to be a better family member). These resources not just make an employee do better at work but he is able to transfer it to family domain due to role integration. Role integration is the view that the two domains as being closely associated with the other. The overlap is so much that each loses its own distinct identity (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). The positive resources enable a person to be a better spouse or parent. It has been shown that daily job satisfaction is positively associated with daily relationship satisfaction and the association is strong for people who are able to integrate work and family domains (Illies, Wilson & Wagner, 2009; Neff & Karney, 2004).

The present finding is in line with previous study of Siu (2013). She has reported that PsyCap can predict employees’ perceptions of work-related physical and psychological well-being and work–family balance five months later. This demonstrates that the present level of PsyCap is predictive of work-family balance over a period of
5 months. The research though not on work-family enrichment does provide evidence that PsyCap is associated with positive experiences of work-family interface.

Table 4.11: Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficients showing Relationship between PsyCap, and Family-to-Work Enrichment for Males (n = 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Family-to-Work Enrichment</th>
<th>Family-to-Work Development</th>
<th>Family-to-Work Affect</th>
<th>Family-to-Work Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>.572**</td>
<td>.423**</td>
<td>.502**</td>
<td>.557**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.508**</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>.489**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.486**</td>
<td>.378**</td>
<td>.408**</td>
<td>.483**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>.571**</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.486**</td>
<td>.552**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>.485**</td>
<td>.185**</td>
<td>.441**</td>
<td>.446**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

The correlation coefficients with their alpha values in the above table indicate that hypothesis 9 stating PsyCap is positively and significantly related to family-to-work enrichment for male employees is accepted.

Table 4.12: Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficients showing Relationship between PsyCap, And Family-to-Work Enrichment for Females (n = 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Family-to-work Enrichment</th>
<th>Family-to-work Development</th>
<th>Family-to-work Affect</th>
<th>Family-to-work Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>.600**</td>
<td>.545**</td>
<td>.664**</td>
<td>.675**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.504**</td>
<td>.437**</td>
<td>.558**</td>
<td>.603**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.461**</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>.523**</td>
<td>.521**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>.514**</td>
<td>.486**</td>
<td>.548**</td>
<td>.606**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>.576**</td>
<td>.493**</td>
<td>.623**</td>
<td>.618**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
The correlation coefficients with their alpha values in the above table indicate that hypothesis 10 stating PsyCap is positively and significantly related to family-to-work enrichment for female employees is accepted.

Evaluating Hypotheses 9 and 10:

PsyCap is significantly associated with family-to-work enrichment (r = .572, p < .01), family-to-work development (r = .423, p < .01), family-to-work affect (r = .502, p < .01) and family-to-work efficiency (r = .557, p < .01) in men (refer Table 4.11). For women, PsyCap is significantly associated with family-to-work enrichment (r = .600, p < .01), family-to-work development (r = .545, p < .01), family-to-work affect (r = .664, p < .01) and family-to-work efficiency (r = .675, p < .01) (refer Table 4.12).

Hope is significantly associated with family-to-work enrichment (r = .508, p < .01), family-to-work development (r = .354, p < .01), family-to-work affect (r = .484, p < .01) and family-to-work efficiency (r = .489, p < .01) in men (refer Table 4.11). Whereas, hope is significantly associated with family-to-work enrichment (r = .504, p < .01), family-to-work development (r = .437, p < .01), family-to-work affect (r = .558, p < .01) and family-to-work efficiency (r = .603, p < .01) in women (refer Table 4.12).

Efficacy is significantly associated with family-to-work enrichment (r = .486, p < .01), family-to-work development (r = .378, p < .01), family-to-work affect (r = .408, p < .01) and family-to-work efficiency (r = .483, p < .01) in men (refer Table 4.11). For female employees, efficacy is significantly associated with family-to-work enrichment (r = .461, p < .01), family-to-work development (r = .398, p < .01), family-to-work affect (r = .523, p < .01) and family-to-work efficiency (r = .521, p < .01) (refer Table 4.12).

Resilience is significantly associated with family-to-work enrichment (r = .571, p < .01), family-to-work development (r = .445, p < .01), family-to-work affect (r = .486, p < .01) and family-to-work efficiency (r = .552, p < .01) in men (refer Table 4.11). For women, resilience is significantly associated with family-to-work enrichment (r = .514, p < .01), family-to-work development (r = .486, p < .01), family-
to-work affect \( (r = .548, p < .01) \) and family-to-work efficiency \( (r = .606, p < .01) \) (refer Table 4.12).

Optimism is significantly associated with family-to-work enrichment \( (r = .485, p < .01) \), family-to-work development \( (r = .185, p < .01) \), family-to-work affect \( (r = .441, p < .01) \) and family-to-work efficiency \( (r = .446, p < .01) \) in men (refer Table 4.11). In case of women, it is significantly associated with work-to-family-to-work enrichment \( (r = .576, p < .01) \), family-to-work development \( (r = .493, p < .01) \), family-to-work affect \( (r = .623, p < .01) \) and family-to-work efficiency \( (r = .618, p < .01) \) (refer Table 4.12).

As discussed in the previous section, PsyCap can be viewed as a personal resource which leads to generation of multiple resources that can influence work-to-family enrichment. Drawing from conservation of resources and the Job demands and resources approach it can be similarly thought as a resource at the family domain that improves family satisfaction and helps to generate further resources like energy, patience and time management skills (Hobfoll, 2002; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Carlson et al., 2006) that can be transferred to the work domain leading to family-to-work enrichment.

Taking another perspective towards family-to-work enrichment, the investigator believes that positive personal characteristics like PsyCap is not just important to meet demands and cope with stressors but it is closely associated with happiness (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999; Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 2001). Happiness is generally understood in terms of joy or pleasantness (hedonic happiness) and the relation between positive states of PsyCap and happiness is found (Youssef & Luthans, 2007) and well explained under the tenets of Fredrickson theory of Broaden and Build (1998, 2001). There is empirical support for the stated relation between PsyCap and eudaimonic happiness, too (Culbertson, Fullager & Mills, 2010). The study found eudaimonic happiness to be a mediator between PsyCap and hedonic happiness.

The investigator would link the mechanism for enriching family life through the capacity of individuals to achieve happiness in both its forms- hedonic and eudaimonic happiness. Eudaimonic happiness or well-being is being happy when a person has self-acceptance, purpose in life, personal growth, positive relations with others,
environmental mastery and autonomy (Ryff, 1989). This indicates a higher order functioning.

Taking it further, individuals who are high on PsyCap experience less impact of self-doubt, criticism, and frustrations, (Bandura & Locke, 2003) are more optimistic about their perceptions to adequately manage demands (Parker, 1998), are hopeful in finding ways to meet challenges, hence coping better (Snyder, 2000; Chang & DeSimone, 2001), and being resilient learn from adverse situations and adapt to the environment more favorably. Such individuals are found to be happier (Kato & Snyder, 2005; Maddi, 1987) and function more optimally (Culbertson, Fullager & Mills, 2010). Following which they accept their strengths and flaws, engage themselves in activities that leads towards self-realization, have more stable values (Coutu, 2002) experience more sense of control over them and the environment, and are intrinsically motivated to achieve the goals for meaningful life (Culbertson, Fullager & Mills, 2010).

Such individuals would therefore participate meaningfully in the family domain, reap its benefits in terms of learning new skills, energizing themselves and will be better able to transfer these benefits to work domain along with becoming more focused at work. The above discussion shows that PsyCap along with its components is greatly beneficial to individuals to have family-to-work enrichment.

4.4.2 Mediation Analyses

Social sciences seek to identify the relationships between various variables. Identifying mediators is championed since mediation entails the process by which the independent variable (IV) impacts on the Dependent variable (DV). Here causality is implied wherein IV is believed to cause DV through the mediator (M) that is the third variable in the study. In other words, The IV causes the DV since IV causes the mediator (M) which further causes the DV. It is crucial that the mediation role should be based on sound theory. In the present study, hypothesis 11 and 12 are based on mediating role of PsyCap in the relationship between social support and work-family enrichment. For testing these hypotheses, data were subjected to hierarchical multiple regressions. Hierarchical multiple regressions give inter relationship values that can help prove the existence of mediation.
The present study employs Baron and Kenny (1986) approach to mediation. This approach continues to be widely used in literature. They have laid down certain conditions which need to be fulfilled for mediation to be supported. In the first step, the IV (X) should significantly predict M and the pathway “a” – i.e. the unstandardised beta coefficient - should be significant. In the next step, the IV (X) should significantly predict DV(Y) with the path coefficient “c” being significant. In the third step, M should significantly predict the DV (Y) in the presence of the IV (X) and the unstandardised beta coefficient “b” should be significant. Finally, when M is in the model, the effect of the IV (X) on the DV (Y) should be reduced. That means the new obtained unstandardised coefficient “c’” should be less than the previous unstandardised coefficient “c”. In case of complete mediation, the c’ path is zero or non-significant.

In the context of the present study, the social support satisfaction variable was selected as the IV (X) as the other variable of social support availability did not significantly correlate with DVs namely work-to-family enrichment (W to F) and family-to-work enrichment (F to W). The variable of PsyCap was selected as the mediator since it is a higher order construct encompassing hope, efficacy, resilience and optimism.

To test for mediation, initially the relation between the social support satisfaction (SSS) (IV) and PsyCap (M) were established by verifying the amount of variance predicted in PsyCap (M) by SSS (IV) and the significance of the path coefficient (a). Then hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted with SSS (IV) in Block 1, and the PsyCap (M) in Block 2. The amount of variance attributable to SSS (IV) in W to F or F to W (DV) was noted along with the unstandardised coefficient beta (c), F and the p values. In the Block 2 similarly the amount of variance attributable to PsyCap (M) in W to F / F to W (DV) was noted along with the unstandardised coefficient beta (b), F and the p values. In the presence of PsyCap (M) entered in Block 2, the path coefficient (c’) for SSS (IV) was noted to see if it had decreased or become zero. Decrease in c’ indicates partial mediation while a non-significant c’ indicates complete mediation. The above analysis was carried for both genders and for both the DVs. Refer Figure 4.3 for the Schematic Hypothesized Meditational Model for PsyCap mediating in the relationship between social support satisfaction and work-to-family enrichment. Summary of results is presented in tables following the figure.
Figure 4.3: The Schematic Hypothesized Meditational Model for Work-to-family Enrichment
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Table 4.13: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Testing the Mediating Effect of PsyCap on the Relationship between Perceived Satisfaction with Social Support (SSS) as a Predictor and Work-to-family Enrichment as a Criterion for Males (n = 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>57.53</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>23.30</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>47.11</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>23.30</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that SSS ($X$) predicts 28.0% variance in PsyCap ($M$) ($\beta = .517$, $p < .01$) and it also predicts 13.6% variance in work-to-family enrichment in the direct relationship with $Y$ ($\beta = .144; p < .01$). PsyCap ($M$) predicts 39.9% variance in Work-to-family enrichment ($\beta=.235. p < .01$). During mediation (model 2) the relationship between PsyCap and work-to-family enrichment continued to remain significant ($\beta=.235. p < .01$); but the relationship between SSS and work-to-family enrichment became non-significant ($\beta =.021; t =7.06, p > .05$) as compared to the direct relationship ($\beta = .144; p < .01$). This indicates complete mediation. Sobel test for significance of the mediating effect showed that it is significant ($z = 7.01 p < .01$). Hypothesis 11 stating PsyCap mediates in the relationship between social support and work-to-family enrichment for male employees is accepted.
Table 4.14: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Testing the Mediating Effect of PsyCap on the Relationship between Perceived Satisfaction with Social Support (SSS) as a Predictor and Work-to-family Enrichment as a Criterion for Females (n = 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>∆R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>107.37</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c’</td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that SSS (X) predicts 32.1% variance in PsyCap (M) (β = .581, p < .01) and it also predicts 8.2% variance in work-to-family enrichment in the direct relationship with Y (β = .089; p < .01). PsyCap (M) predicts 45.5% variance in Work-to-family enrichment (β = .228, p < .01). During mediation (model 2), the relationship between PsyCap and work-to-family enrichment continued to remain significant (β = .228, p < .01) but the relationship between SSS and work-to-family enrichment became non-significant (β = -.044; t = -1.93, p > .05) as compared to the direct relationship (β = .089; p < .01). This indicates complete mediation. Sobel test for significance of the mediating effect showed that it is significant (z = 10.61 p < .01). Hypothesis 12 stating PsyCap mediates in the relationship between social support and work-to-family enrichment for female employees is accepted.

**Evaluating the Hypotheses 11 and 12:**

PsyCap is a significant mediator in work-to-family enrichment in both genders. The present study provides evidence for satisfaction with the social support acting through PsyCap to enable individuals to experience work-to-family enrichment.

Behavioural outcome is a result of the interaction between environment and the individual. Having satisfying relationships is a job resource that improves active positive coping strategies and allows job crafting (Bakker and Schaufelli, 2008). Job crafting (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001) refers to employees taking the initiative to choose tasks, contents of it, assigning meaning to it and control over whom to interact with while performing the job (Parker & Ohly, 2008). Job crafting along with active
coping styles can give an employee a sense of control over their work, helps them better adapt to challenges, creates positive attribution for future success and makes them hopeful, thus improving PsyCap.

PsyCap which is a higher order construct consisting of Self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience can be an important personal resource that helps people to deal with emotional exhaustion, depersonalization related to burnout and push the employee towards enhanced performance through increased levels of work engagement (Prieto, Soria, Martínez & Schaufeli, 2008).

Interestingly, personal resource such as PsyCap leads to work engagement and work engagement leads to creation of higher levels of personal resources (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2009). Drawing from Conservation of resources theory this positive spiral of resource gain helps an employee accumulate resources of different kinds including other job resources (Hobfoll, 2002). A resourceful environment further leads to satisfaction with the work domain (Avey et al., 2011; Luthans et al., 2007) through work engagement. For example, employees working in a resourceful environment are likely to develop positive perceptions about themselves and their abilities to cope with adversities at work. In turn, these personal resources will be positively related to employees experiencing more vigour, dedication and absorption in work and job satisfaction. This is empirically supported by studies wherein personal resources like self-efficacy, optimism, and organization-based self-esteem and PsyCap played a mediating role between job resources and work engagement (Vink, Ouweneel, & Le Blanc, 2011, Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007).

Work which is a viewed as meaningful and is carried out in a context of perceived social support makes a person competent, autonomous and resilient; these are factors conducive to wellbeing beyond the workplace (Ryan & Deci, 2001). An employee who has resources in plenty should be expected to experience a wellbeing state. Hence, he or she will be transferring the positive effects to other life domains like the family through positive spillover (Bakker, Westman, & Van Emmerik, 2009). PsyCap can act as a mediator as it has both the cognitive nature and has positive emotional states (Bandura, 1997; Snyder et al., 2000). Therefore, work-to-family enrichment is possible as PsyCap helps perceive the challenges of both domain as manageable and at the same time the positive psychological capacities lead to positive emotions that are related to various outcomes like higher energy levels, health and more
positivity (Snyder & Lopez, 2009) which are invested in family domain to enrich the experience there. In support of this finding, Luthans, Youssef, Sweetman and Harms (2013) have reported that PsyCap which is associated with a domain satisfaction (for example work) is also related to satisfaction with other domains (for example relationship or health) and is similarly related to overall life satisfaction.

More recently, PsyCap has been found to lower the interpersonal conflict spillover from work to non-work domains (Inés Martinez-Corts, Demerouti, Bakker, Boz, 2015). To elaborate it further, interpersonal conflict at work can spillover to family as the employee may show negative behaviour towards the family members (Bakker, Demerouti, & Dollard, 2008) or employees may be preoccupied about the conflict when they are with the family, adversely slowing down the recovery process (Sonnentag, Kuttler, & Fritz, 2010). But the study found that when employees were equipped with adequate levels of PsyCap they could stop the negative carry over effect from work-to-family domain. Thus, PsyCap acted as a buffer in the negative spillover from work-to-family. This indicates multiple ways in which PsyCap can function to enhance work-to-family enrichment.

In sum, we can conclude that PsyCap is a pathway through which supportive relationships lead to work-to-family enrichment.

Refer Figure 4.4 for the Schematic Hypothesized Meditational Model for PsyCap mediating in the relationship between social support satisfaction and family-to-work enrichment. Summary of results is presented in tables following the figure.

Figure 4.4: The Schematic Hypothesized Meditational Model for Family-to-work Enrichment
Table 4.15: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Testing the Mediating Role of PsyCap in Relationship between Perceived Satisfaction with Social Support (SSS) as a Predictor and Family-to-work Enrichment as a Criterion Variable for Males (n = 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>57.53</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>44.51</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>44.51</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that SSS (X) predicts 28% variance in PsyCap (M) ($\beta = .517, p < .01$) and it also predicts 24.6% variance in family-to-work enrichment in the direct relationship with Y ($\beta = .160; p < .01$). PsyCap (M) predicts 32.7% variance in family-to-work enrichment ($\beta = .44; p < .01$). During mediation (model 2) the relationship between PsyCap and family-to-work enrichment continued to remain significant ($\beta = .44; p < .01$) but the relationship between SSS and family-to-work enrichment became weaker and remained significant ($\beta = .08; t = 3.21, p < .01$) as compared to the direct relationship ($\beta = .160; p < .01$). This indicates partial mediation. Sobel test for significance of the mediating effect showed that it is significant ($z = 4.29, p < .01$). Hypothesis 13 stating that PsyCap mediates in the relationship between social support and family-to-work enrichment for male employees is supported.

Table 4.16: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Testing the Mediating Role of PsyCap in Relationship between Perceived Satisfaction with Social Support (SSS) as a Predictor and Family-to-Work Enrichment as a Criterion Variable for Females (n = 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>3.157</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>43.39</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows that SSS (X) predicts 32% variance in PsyCap (M) \((\beta = .581, p < .01)\) and it also predicts 14.6% variance in family-to-work enrichment in the direct relationship with Y \((\beta = .071; p < .01)\). PsyCap (M) predicts 36% variance in family-to-work enrichment \((\beta = .185; p < .01)\). During mediation (model 2) the relationship between PsyCap and family-to-work enrichment continued to remain significant \((\beta = .185; p < .01)\) but the relationship between SSS and work-to-family enrichment became weaker and non-significant \((\beta = -.037; t = 1.64, p > .05)\) as compared to the direct relationship \((\beta = .071; p < .01)\). Sobel test for significance of the mediating effect showed that it is significant \((z = 2.97 p < .01)\). This indicates complete mediation. Hypothesis 14 stating that PsyCap mediates in the relationship between social support and family-to-work enrichment for female employees is supported.

*Evaluating Hypotheses 13 and 14:*

The above results indicate that PsyCap acts as a mediator in the relationship between perceived satisfaction with social support and family-to-work enrichment.

Support derived from deep and satisfying relationship has been found to be crucial in human optimal functioning. People who are more socially integrated and experience more rewarding relationships have better mental health, subjective well-being and lower negative health outcomes. There are plenty of studies in extant literature that support this view for example; Studies of Cohen, 2004; Cohen & Syme, 1985; Collins, Dunkel-Schetter, Lobel, & Scrimshaw, 1993; Kawachi & Berkman, 2001; Lakey & Cronin, 2008; Gurung, Sarason, & Sarason, 1997; Seeman, 2000; Uchino, 2009.

Recently, Feeny and Collins (2014) have put forth the idea of thriving which is similar to flourishing state. Thriving is growth, development, and prosperity in personal sphere and relationally and is discussed in varied ways by many theorists (for example Benson & Scales, 2009; Bundick, Yeager, King, & Damon, 2010; Diener *et al.*, 2010; Keyes, 2007; Ryff & Singer, 2008).

Feeny and Collins (2014) propose thriving to be a consequence of meaningful experience of social support. According to them, supportive relations serve two functions that allow for thriving to occur. Firstly, supportive relations help people cope with adversity successfully by providing, assistance, emotional support and care...
(Collins & Feeney, 2000; Feeney, 2004; Feeney & Collins, 2004). Secondly, these relations aid in thriving by encouraging individuals to engage in tasks that will increase their well-being (Bowlby, 1988; Fredrickson, 2001) and help them find purpose in life (Ryff & Singer, 1998).

Thriving construct has a component of psychological well-being. It is “positive self-regard, self-acceptance, resilience/hardiness, a positive belief system, the absence of mental health symptoms or disorders” (Feeny & Collins, 2014, pg 2). Thus, supportive relations function dually to develop positive psychological capacities of resilience through emotional sharing (Ryff & Singer, 2000), make them confident of their capabilities (Berkman, 1995), hopeful and optimistic in their world views. Individuals with high PsyCap will experience stronger sense of self-worth and be in better state of health and wellness (Taylor, Kemeny, Reed, Bower, & Gruenewald, 2000). Positive self beliefs is associated with enhanced levels of positive mood, higher motivation to succeed, persistence with a goal, engaging in productive work and therefore greater accomplishments (Taylor & Brown, 1988) and also serves to cope better with life irritations in a better manner (Taylor et al., 2000).

Following this discussion, it can be understood that PsyCap developed from satisfying relationships can generate positive emotions, energy for constructive work and better coping with stressors. In the context of family-to-work interface, PsyCap makes a person successful in playing the multiple roles of being a home maker, parent and spouse. The resource of PsyCap will help working parents to accept reality and firmly hold onto stable, meaningful values and beliefs (Coutu, 2002). Besides, due to a reservoir of resources they would be less likely to suffer from resource loss and better able to cope with work-family demands (Hobfoll, 2002). Hence, they would perceive higher amounts of family satisfaction which could spill over to work enabling them to be better employees.

Support for Hypotheses 11, 12, 13 and 14 implies that PsyCap plays a meditational role between perceived social support satisfaction and work-family enrichment. Having secure and profound relationships allows for independence, enhanced levels of activity and courage in one’s actions in that individual which in turn allows for building autonomy, competence and relatedness (Bowlby 1969; LaGuardia,Ryan, Couchman, & Deci, 2000; Nezlek, 2000). Such functional support helps create a psychological resource like PsyCap, a higher order construct comprising
of resilience, hope, self-efficacy and optimism. Efficacious individual is more likely to be confident about his goals at work or at family. Hope may provide individuals a positive resource for dealing with anxiety-provoking situations while protecting them against perceptions of helplessness, uncontrollability and capriciousness (Liu, Hu, Wang, Sui & Ma, 2013). Resiliency provides support to recover from adversity, thrive when faced with positive change (Block & Kremen, 1996). Such individuals will be successful in applying skills, positive emotions, capital from work-place to family and vice versa. PsyCap being both cognitive and behavioural in nature and being an integral part of an individual helps the individual to be successful in any chosen domain (work or family) and helps to transfer resources from one domain to other domain to increase the performance of the other domain.

To conclude it can be stated that when employees have good social resources they will develop personal resources of PsyCap, which will enable them to have positive work experiences that will add to the effect on their family role and vice versa (Greenhaus & Powell 2006). Employees are more likely to report greater satisfaction in both roles. Consequently, there will be work-family enrichment. Work-family enrichment occurs when the employee benefits from successful participation in both work and family roles through the bi-directional spillover of developmental resources, positive affect, psychosocial capital and efficiency gains (Carlson et al. 2006).
4.4.3 Additional Findings

Gender Differences

The gender differences were explored using the independent samples t-test. The results are presented and discussed in this section.

Table 4.17: Summary of Results of Independent Samples t-test showing the Significance of Difference between Male and Female Employees on the Variables under Study (df = 298)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>125.27</td>
<td>8.330</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>121.59</td>
<td>7.635</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>31.41</td>
<td>2.533</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30.99</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>31.26</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30.60</td>
<td>2.174</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>31.60</td>
<td>2.247</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td>1.932</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30.96</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30.18</td>
<td>1.977</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFE</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>3.301</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>35.57</td>
<td>2.301</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWE</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>34.22</td>
<td>2.842</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>35.75</td>
<td>2.101</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>58.19</td>
<td>8.457</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>18.66</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>74.09</td>
<td>6.102</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>127.20</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>126.74</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that there are significant gender differences on all variables except for efficacy ($t = 1.51$, df = 298, $p > 0.05$) and social support satisfaction ($t = .437$, df = 298, $p > 0.05$).
Work-family enrichment:

The women score significantly higher than men on both work-to-family enrichment ($t = 3.77$, df = 298, $p < 0.01$) and family-to-work enrichment ($t = 5.31$, df = 298, $p < 0.01$). Similar gender differences have been found in previous studies, too. In the study of Grzywacz and Marks (2000) as well as Grywacz, Almeida and McDonald (2002), women were found to be higher on work family enrichment than their male counterparts. Kirchmeyer (1992, 1995) supported the findings and explained in terms of ego involvement of women in roles and their use of active coping. Gender role socialization and men experiencing segmentation of roles rather than role integration (Andrews & Bailyn, 1993) may be another plausible explanation for this finding.

PsyCap:

The men were found to be higher than women on PsyCap ($t = 3.99$, df = 298, $p < 0.01$). Also, men were significantly higher than female employees on resilience ($t = 6.21$, df = 298, $p < 0.01$), optimism ($t = 5.71$, df = 298, $p < 0.01$), and hope ($t = 2.70$, df = 298, $p < 0.01$). The results are in accordance with previous studies which have found gender difference in PsyCap for example Lehoczky, 2013.

In the Indian context, there are presently two studies which have reported gender differences on PsyCap namely by Singh and Garg (2014) and Parthi and Gupta (2016). Singh and Garg (2014) found that females were higher than males on PsyCap while the study by Parthi and Gupta (2016) reported that the male employees were higher on PsyCap than their female counterparts. Parthi and Gupta (2016) have attributed the finding to occupational differences as their sample belonged to the telecom industry and the sample of the Singh and Garg (2014) study consisted of teachers. The present study was conducted on manufacturing and service sector employees and is in line with the Parthi and Gupta study (2016). The findings suggest that occupational setting can play an important role in building gender specific PsyCap.

Furthermore, in the present study there were no gender difference on efficacy found this is similar to the finding of Parthi and Gupta (2016) study. This supports the view that self-efficacy is context specific and men and women employees were equally efficacious at their work. Men were found to be more optimist than females which is in
accordance with the earlier studies like that of Puskar et al., (2010). With regard to resilience that is the capacity to bounce back in face of adversity male employees were higher than female employees. This can be viewed as evidence that socially and physically, men are expected to be the stronger of the two genders and therefore more resilient. This is also supported by the findings of the studies by Broadman et al., (2008), Waaktaar and Torgersen, (2012) and Parthi and Gupta, (2016). In the attribute of being hopeful, the present study found men to be more hopeful than women. Hope refers to thinking of different pathways to achieve the goals. Men might have access to different social resources (Ramadoss & Rajadhyaksha, 2012) at their disposal and so may develop positive perceptions about being successful in their goals as compared to the females.

*Perceived social support:*

Men perceived poorer levels of social support availability than women \( (t = 18.66, \text{df} = 298, \ p < .01) \). This is consistent with past literature where married men were found to be more dependent on their spouse while married women report to have multiple sources of support which includes friends, relatives and neighbours (Haines & Hurlbert, 1992). Overall, women have greater number of relationships because they are high on emotional expressiveness. They engage in empathetic behaviours and therefore invest more efforts in others thus having more sources of support. Men, on the other hand, are socialized to present an image of mastery and control (Magen & Konasewich, 2011), therefore may not express the need for help and hence may not explore the possible sources of support available in their environment. It is recorded by the findings of Matheny, Ashby and Cupp (2005) and Taylor et al., (2000) that women are more likely of the two genders, to seek support during stressful situations. It is worthwhile to note that there was no significant difference between the genders on satisfaction with the support. Similar finding was reported by Kasprzak (2010) where men and women appraised the satisfaction with support in equal terms. Satisfaction is a cognitive construct affected by other factors but not by the context of gender.

The above discussion on the quantitative gives rise to a few questions like why the availability of support sources did not qualify as important predictors in work-family enrichment. How do men and women employees view work-family enrichment? The answers to these questions would go a long way to understand the phenomenon of work-
family enrichment especially in an Indian setting. The next section deals with analysis of the qualitative data.

**Correlation of socio-demographical variables with variables of the study:**

There were no significant correlations found between family income, no. of children, educational level and the predictors or criterion variables. While, age \( (r = .246, p < .01) \) was significantly associated with work-to-family enrichment in women. It was also associated with family-to-work enrichment \( (r = .244, p < .01) \) in women. Besides, years of experience \( (r = .223, p < .01) \) was significantly associated with work-to-family enrichment and with family-to-work enrichment \( (r = .222, p < .01) \) in women. This indicates that older female employees and one’s with more experience have better work-family enrichment than the younger and those with less work experience. This suggests that with age and experience female employees may accumulate more social and psychological resources that allow them to engage in work-family enrichment. Surprisingly, Age was not a significant correlate of PsyCap \( (r = .126, p > .05) \) in women while experience was significantly associated with PsyCap \( (r = .178, p < .01) \) in them. It can be suggested that work provides resources which help to develop the competencies of hope, optimism, resilience and optimism. This needs to be probed further. Work experience was correlated with perceived satisfaction of support \( (r = .149, p < .01) \) while age was not \( (r = .113, p > .05) \) in women. Interestingly, none of these relations were found in men.

**4.5 QUALITATIVE STUDY**

The quantitative analysis showed a scope to understand the work-family enrichment through the qualitative data. As mentioned earlier, the research questions for qualitative analysis were to verify why social support sources did not predict work-family enrichment? What are lived experiences of employees who experience work-family enrichment? What is the social context where work-family enrichment takes place? What are the factors that facilitate it? What are the strategies that employees deploy to enable work-family enrichment? And finally, what are the benefits of work-family enrichment? The answers to these questions could be found only by taking the qualitative route. The next section deals with analysis of the qualitative data and the emergent findings.
4.5.1 Qualitative Study: Data Analyses

Thirty employees were interviewed to extract answers to the questions raised above, from their perspective. The obtained information was analyzed qualitatively. The data obtained through interviews was subjected to open coding from which various themes emerged. These themes were classified into central themes by the process of axial coding.

For this study, it was decided to follow the paradigm model put forth by Strauss and Corbin (1990). The paradigm model has six categories which are phenomenon, causal conditions, context, intervening conditions, action/interactional strategies and consequences. The label names given for the central themes are based on previous literature and theory. The central themes are as follows: Work-Family Enrichment further classified into work-to-family enrichment and family-to-work enrichment. The next theme is social resources and included sources of support and nature of support. The third central theme was named context for work-family enrichment encompassing family, organization and culture. The intervening variable was named as psychological resources and included personal characteristics and role salience. Action strategies are named building of resource pool and comprised of multiple strategies employed for self-development. The last central theme was named outcomes of work–family enrichment and it included life satisfaction and work engagement. Figure 4.5 depicts the central themes and categories under them. The following section shows how selective coding helped to understand individual domains in detail.
I. **The Work-Family Enrichment**

The present theme is based on how does the role performance in one domain enhance the role performance in other domain? This establishes the existence of the phenomenon under study namely work-family enrichment.

*Work-to-family enrichment:*

There was 100% agreement on work impacts family. This is seen through the illustrative quote, “*My work gives me money and that allows me to keep my family comfortable*” (Case 1). The negative impact was brought forth by Case 23 “*because of my work I have to be away from my children. It gives me less time with them*” also family preoccupations interfere with work as per quote of Case 28 “*when my mother was sick and had to be hospitalized I could not focus on my task*. Since the study aimed at discovering the positive side of family and work this code has not been elaborated.
The employees agreed that having a job generated resources which they could transfer to family to become better family member. “Success at work gives me self-confidence, makes me calmer and gives me stability. So, I feel confident even in my relationships outside office” (Case 6). “My Work has made me more disciplined and confident about being able to manage new challenges at the home front” (Case 7).

The varied experiences regarding work-to-family enrichment could be clubbed into the three sub categories as mentioned by Carlson et al (2006), namely work-to-family development, work-to-family capital and work-to-family affect. Work-to-family development: It refers to different viewpoints, skills and knowledge gained at work that helps employees to be a better family member (Carlson et al. 2006). For example, Case 15 said, “Through work I come across different people. I can see how people can react differently to similar situations. This has made me less rigid and more accepting of people. I think this has made me patient. I am now better able to resolve the conflicts and differences in my family”.

Work-to-family capital: It is conceived as personal fulfillment, a sense of accomplishment, sense of success experienced at work, which makes an employee a better family member (Carlson et al., 2006). This is reported by Case 13 as, “Yes, I learnt prioritizing at my first job. When there are so many tasks to be done, I make a list of which task should be done first. This skill has translated to home. I can achieve so much at the end of the day. It makes me feel successful in both work and family sphere.”

Work-to-family affect: It is conceived as overall mood, feeling of happiness and being cheerful at work that helps employees to be a better family member (Carlson et al., 2006). This was reported by almost every interviewee. “When I am happy with job, then I am also happy at home.” (Case 18)

Family-to-work enrichment:

Case 14 stated, “My life means my work and family. They definitely blend into each other.” This shows family is an integral part of work life. And at the same time employees were aware of how family preoccupations could interfere with work as per quote “when my brother lost his job, I was disturbed and could not do my job with focus”. (Case 26)
There was consensus on the fact that having a family generated resources which they could transfer to work to become better employee as stated in “A very positive relationship with my wife influences my work positively because she loves me and that gives me self-confidence, energy and everything I need to do the job effectively.” (Case 1)

The family-to-work enrichment experiences were clubbed into sub categories of family-to-work development, family-to-work efficiency, and family-to-work affect.

Family-to-work development: It refers to different viewpoints, skills and knowledge gained at family that helps family member to be a better employee (Carlson et al. 2006). For example, Case 14 reported, “My father was very particular about how I managed my time. Today at work I have so many commitments. But thanks to my father I use my time management skills and get lot of things done”.

Family-to-work efficiency: It is conceived as family helping to not waste time at work; encouragement by family for using work time in a focused manner, family allowing to be focused on work and all this helps to be a better worker (Carlson et al., 2006). “My in laws manage so much at home. Groceries, children and family rituals so I can work so relaxed,” Case 11.

Family-to-work affect: It is conceived as overall mood, feeling of happiness and being cheerful at family that helps employees to be a better employee (Carlson et al., 2006). This was reported by almost every participant. For illustration Case 8 said, “If I enjoy my weekends with my family I feel refreshed to come to work on Monday.”

II. Social Resources

This theme arose out of how social support plays a role in work-family enrichment. The interviewees credited presence of social support for their work-family enrichment. Case 12 stated, “I am blessed to have such wonderful people around me. They support me and so I can step out of the house and work full-time”. The important sources identified by the sample were spouse, domestic help, family and work-place support.

Support from spouse was reported to be crucial. Case 4 stated, “My wife is simply amazing. When I have a bad day at work she listens to me patiently. She helps me unwind by cooking my favourite meal.” While Case 20 said, “My husband
encourages me to do well in my job”. Most women reported that their husbands provided mostly moral support and encouraged them to pursue their ambitions. They also stated that husbands felt proud of their job role. Case 24 remarked, “My husband takes pride in me working for this reputed company”. This is an encouraging sign. On the other hand, men said their spouses provided emotional and instrumental support. Case 20 said, “She is the one who manages the household. She is the captain of the house”. Women took primary responsibility of managing the household. Though, men too reported pitching in household chores. Case5 said, “It is my responsibility to get monthly groceries. I and my wife have divided the household chores. Yet, if either of us is busy in work commitments, the other does his/her task. It is flexible that way”. Case 20 reported, “I am good in Maths and so I look after my son’s Maths home work.” So there seemed to be participation of the men in household duties.

Women employees reported they all had employed maids to do the washing and household cleaning. “It is not possible to do everything by ourselves. My maid is working for us for past 10 years and is like a family member”, said Case 11. Reliance on maids and paid labour to carry out mundane tasks was routine for most. This domestic help in the form of cleaners, cooks and maids reduced the men and women’s time spent on household tasks and gave them more time for leisure. “My bai (domestic help) is a valuable support. Last month she was ill with typhoid and I felt so overwhelmed by all the household tasks”, said Case 24. This brought out a facet about this source of support- they being from unorganized sector there is no immediate substitution possible.

Family support was in the form of in-laws and parents. They contributed to the child care support. Child care support was seen as an important dimension. For child care, women employed nannies or made arrangements in crèches or relied on in-laws or parents for support. Parents of children in the age group of 6 months to 6 years were the most affected. “I do not want to leave my children with strangers so I leave them with my family. Otherwise, I would have been hesitant in leaving my child. My mother-in-law stays at our house and takes care of my children. I have also employed a girl who takes care of my son. Because of this support system I do not feel guilty” Case 9. This case brought out an important point of guilt. Women experienced more episodes of guilt than their male colleagues. When probed about it, women stated that though women have stepped out for work, child care and home management is still thought to be her primary responsibility in the Indian context. Apart from that, in-laws still continued to harbour
traditional view of good daughter-in-law as one who caters to all their needs and would not expect them to work. Therefore, women perceived that they may not genuinely want to render help to them. Case 25 reported that “my in laws upfront told me they should not be seen as source of child care support on a long term basis. They had raised their son and now it was our turn to raise ours. So, though initially reluctant I had to keep my son in crèche”. Case 27 said “I wish my father takes my daughter’s school home- work but he enjoys taking her to the park”. This showed that the support sought and support received did not match, leading to dissatisfaction. Apart from willingness to help and type of help rendered, support satisfaction was related to the support givers characteristics. Case 30 said “My mother is becoming old. Her knees pain a lot. She has to run about the house to look after my children. This makes me guilty.” Case 27 reported, “The crèche is clean and hygienic. The place is close to my house. They charge quite a lot but what can I do? It has fewer holidays than other places here, so I prefer paying more.” This shows that not all crèches are same in the quality of child care provided. Economics play a part in deciding child care support.

Apart from spouse, family and paid domestic help, employees relied on work place support, chiefly their boss and colleagues. “I have a good boss. My boss is my mentor, he also values family life. And that helps a lot. He understands my situation much better”, said Case 4. “When my child is sick my colleagues help me out. I too do the same for them”, reported Case 9. This brings out the aspect of reciprocity in help. Case 29 said, “Sometimes I do not take help of my co-workers because it makes me feel less competent”. “The boss does not have the willingness to explain all the queries I have” said Case 16. Besides, Case 22 pointed out, “My boss feels work should always be a priority and family is secondary. So, when I have family issues I do not discuss with him.” Thus, social resources can be valued as per the perceptions of satisfaction with the support.

III. Context for Work-Family Enrichment

The phenomenon of work- family enrichment has been viewed in the context of family, organization and culture. The nature of family is either nuclear or joint. Majority of the sample were from nuclear families. Case 21 defined nuclear family, “My close family is my husband and two children”. Case 19 reported being a part of joint family, “My family of four stays with my parents and my brother’s family, too.” Apart from these two, Case 14 spoke about extended family “as relatives, neighbours and all my friends
who include my colleagues”. This indicates that who is family and who is not may be blurred and differ from person to person.

Another aspect of family is presence of children. The present sample consisted of all married employees who were parents. They either had a single child or two or three children. The interviewees were unanimous in saying that arrival of children had changed their lives. Younger children were said to be a source of joy like expressed by Case 9, “I miss my daughter playing peek-a-boo. She was such an angel”. Case 4 reported, “My son is 12 and already I find him so mature. He looks at me and knows if I have had a good day or bad. He makes me laugh with all his stories from school”. “I believe my children are independent and have their own opinions because of the type of interaction we have. They give us different perspectives to look at the world and a feeling of pride” said Case11. Catering to their future needs is seen as an important reason to work in men and women.

In Indian context, family plays a crucial role in decision making of an individual. Right from career choice, to choosing a mate, raising children, and so forth. The family norms are well-defined and people follow it. Conformity is rewarded with social support and deviance is frowned upon. Case 14 said, “Since I had inter-caste marriage my parents were unwilling to help me with my child. Slowly it has changed but still they resent having a son in law who is not from their community.”

The work that one does is important in defining the enrichment process. Most of the sample reported enjoying their work. Case 2 said, “My job is challenging and allows me great opportunities to grow….. the task requires me to coordinate with other members and customers. It has expanded my social network. Being with my team gives me happiness”. Apart from the work itself, the size of work group was seen to impact. Case 17 said, “In my office, there are 20 people but we having a close group of four with whom I share the most.” This brings out that people are more inclined to build intimate groups and have in-group and out-group feelings. Case 16 narrated, “I am from UP, so in my company I and other members have come together due to our similar background”. People try to form groups based on ethnicity, gender and caste. Similarity in status is also important in interactions at work place. Most employees agreed on the presence of welfare benefits in the organizations. Besides, the statutory ones, there was crèche at the workplace in two organizations. There was a provision of gym in one organization. Case 17 stated “We avail the leaves that are sanctioned to us. About other
facilities it is not used as much. We have no time for it and sometimes we get the feeling the boss does not approve of us spending time on non-work activities”. This shows availability of resources did not mean its utilization. Most employees complained about the weekly off being Thursday in the manufacturing sector. Case2 said “I am unable to spend time on Sunday with my family as I have to go for work. While on Thursday I am at home and they are at school and work. But now we have come to terms with it”.

The next aspect of context is the culture. Culture is all pervasive and cannot be divorced from any phenomenon. Different dimensions of culture were brought out by the employees in the qualitative analysis. Employees reported that religion and practice of religious traditions and rituals are an important part of their lives. “The first thing in the morning I pray. It gives me a lot of peace” said case 18. “Without doing my pooja I do not step out for work” said case 17. “At my workplace, I have a picture of lord Ganesh. I bow to him before I start my work” said case 19. Besides, employees both men and women keep fast for religious reasons like Case 21 “During Ramzan, I am on fast for 40 days. I have been keeping it since my childhood. It is important for me”. Participation in these activities was deemed necessary for family well-being and prosperity. Case 11 said, “Worship of Lord Ganesh and Gauri Puja is an important annual festival. I take leave from work. It gives me immense satisfaction and all of us come together for it”. Religion in Indian culture is all pervasive. It affects every sphere including the work place. Employees use the rituals and traditions as a tool of coping and religious festivities have an important place in their lives. Organizations, managers and supervisors who were sensitive to this aspect were looked upon favorably and helped the employees feel good about the work place and the superiors. These celebrations and festivals also provide an opportunity to the employees to transfer their skills and knowledge. Case 12 confirmed this, “I have fifty people visiting us for Durga Puja. I am able to manage it without a hitch. It boosts my confidence and makes me positive”.

There was a part of sample which did not believe in the above ritualistic nature but spoke about another Indian concept of Nishkama Karma. Case 30 said “I just do my duty both at work and at family. We should not be attached to the fruit of our labour. This thought gives me inner peace and contentment and allows me to play both roles effectively. I transfer the learning but not the affect”. This indicates that participation in
roles which is driven by an overarching life philosophy can influence work-family enrichment in unique ways.

Besides, a patriarchal pattern which believes in classical gender role division was also found prevalent. Case 28 is a first-generation woman who was gainfully employed. She said, “Initially I had to struggle a lot where I was trying to be superwoman doing traditional role as well as my work responsibilities. I had no role model either in the family or at work. I built my capacities because I wanted to work”. While Case 12 who had, a working mother said, “I said to my husband that you have to work at home too. I cannot do it all alone. We both have to share the housework.” There are three men who said like Case 3, “My mother worked and did all the household chores singlehandedly. But I cannot expect that of my wife. It is inhuman. We divide our chores and so both are happy.” This shows a positive trend where woman is trying to be assertive and men truly want to participate in home activities.

IV. Personal Characteristics

When asked to describe themselves, the sample reported words like “Cheerful”, “Nothing can shake me”, “Positive”, “Happy”, “Strong”, “Extravert” and “Confident” Case 7 stated, “People call me friendly and ask me for my advice”. Case 6 remarked, “Over the years my family trusts me to take better decisions as I am rising in my career. This makes me more responsible”. Women reported being strong in the sense- “At times the work pressures are high and at home there are guests or children’s exams. In those time, I keep my cool, seek help from extended family and colleagues and I know I will ultimately manage. This is part of being a working mother” Case 10.

When probed into changes that they have experienced since they started working and starting the family, Case 23 stated, “I have rose in my career and along the way gained my skills like time management, financial and resource management. From being a team member I have become a leader. I try and understand my juniors especially the young mothers.” Case 29 stated, “Technology at work place has increased and I have learnt to cope with it. My children have helped me in learning the use of internet and computer. They are much smarter in those areas.”

Case 5 “The presence of my wife is very relaxing. She has taught me to be patient with my staff at work. She shares her insights with how to deal with people and
that has helped at work place”. This shows how responsive and sensitive support is valued. “I did not know to cook. My mother in law taught me. Today I love to cook for family. It has made me happy” Case 30. Others in the family can be a resource when they teach new skills that improves self-efficacy and self-esteem.

Case 5 brought out a relevant thought, “I feel I am my biggest resource. The way I think makes a huge difference to my life”. Case 2 recorded, “When things do not go my way I do not give up. I try and think of different ways to meet the situation. At times, I feel burdened but something inside me tells me to not give up”. This shows how employees learn to identify different paths making them hopeful, optimistic and resilient. Discussing how people help during difficulties, Case 11 stated, “My colleagues give me technical assistance and fill in for me when I have to manage house emergencies.” Case 10 said, “My spouse comes early the day I am caught up in meetings”. No doubt people are willing to help but it also requires certain qualities from themselves. Elaborating on this aspect, Case 19 said, “I can’t keep running to my boss and colleagues for assistance all the time. It is expected that I learn the required skills over the period. Competence is very important. If I learn the skills which I did not know earlier, it makes people respect me.” The above narrative indicates that support cannot be a commodity that is freely given. It requires certain qualities on the part of the receiver. The above narrations indicate that other people have a role in building one’s capacities and the employees value their own skill development and believe they can manage their lives’ challenges too.

Role Salience is another aspect that was reported by all participants. Case 18 said, “We have to value our job first so that others will do”. Also, Case 2 said, “At the work place, I have shared how important my family is to me and they understand”. Gender difference was noted by the following narrative of Case 7, “My husband has two lives work life and family life. But for me there is no such demarcation. My family knows everything about my work and my colleagues know about my family. I cannot be two different persons.”
V. Building of Resource Pool

Most respondents reported they live enriched lives. They are constantly learning to do new things or want new experiences. Case 13 stated, “I recently joined Zumba classes. It is so much fun and keeps me fit”. Most of the participants were conscious about being fit and healthy like Case 9 “I and my husband go for morning walk; it is so refreshing and gives us some time together”. Case 12 remarked, “I enjoy baking. I learnt it recently. It brings smile to my children’s faces”. Case 4 reported, “At work in order to be ahead of others I constantly upgrade myself in terms of knowledge and skills. This makes me more confident at work and happy.” Case 15 said, ‘I have learnt to be tactful, to be assertive, and to find a way to approach problems in day-to-day situations. Sitting at home would not have exposed me to this. Having worked teaches you to cope with frustration, to solve problems; it improves who you are’.

Another domain was of prioritizing. Men and women spoke in terms of prioritizing career goals, life goals, and financial goals in terms of time orientation. There were short term goals as well as long term goals. Case 10 said, ‘The most important thing is prioritizing. Because I have a family and I also work I need to decide what is important at that point of time and take decision accordingly.’ Women stated like Case 12, “When my children were young I let go of a few career opportunities because it entailed travelling. I did not want to be away from my family.” Case 28 stated, “I had to clear an exam for promotion and we delayed having a second child”. Planning and advance preparation was also noted. Case 7 reported, “I have school going children so I plan the menu for their tiffins in advance. I do preparations night before so that mornings are not a rush”. This ability helped solve problems and negotiate daily hassles. Being organized and punctual made their lives simpler.

Leisure was thought to be important. It gave them a break from routine and refreshed them. Most preferred going to close by places for long weekends. Being dual earners could allow them to engage in these trips. Besides, there were regular eating out trying new cuisine and engaging in passive and active recreational activities. Case 4 stated, “At times on Sunday we simply laze around doing nothing in particular. Sometimes we watch movies or go to the park.” Most people thought about leisure as a means to “recharge themselves”
A few engaged in social initiatives and were part of NGO’s or Clubs or ganapati mandals or housing society responsibilities. Taking up these causes allowed them to feel worthwhile and build on their network pool. Men reported engaging in these activities more than females. Some of them spoke in terms of giving back to society.

VI. Life Satisfaction

Majority of respondents reported feeling highly satisfied with their lives. Women agreed with this illustrative quote of Case 29 “When I was in college I felt strongly about working and at the same time having family and raising up kids. Today I feel fulfilled. There was struggle when children were young but now it has all worked out well. I could not ask for more”.

Consequences of positive experiences of combining work and family were manifold from being able to lead a quality life to improving skills to feelings of contributing to the society and making use of one’s education fruitfully. These experiences gave them joy, energized them, made them feel in control and empowered them. They reported having good relations with the spouse and family. They felt privileged. Most of them expressed gratitude towards parents, spouse or siblings or boss or organizations where they worked or god for what they had achieved.

Besides, they reported being more involved in their work. Case 19 stated, “I am working for past 12 years and I feel a lot of enthusiasm and am motivated to complete my tasks successfully.” Thus, participants showed high levels of work engagement, too.

4.5.2 Qualitative Study: Discussion

Since, the research design used was the mixed sequential explanatory design where the quantitative results direct the qualitative data, one of the research questions formulated was why availability of social support sources did not predict work-family enrichment. The data collected was not restricted to only this question. The other research questions were Does participation in role performance in one domain improve role in another domain? In what context is the work-family enrichment experienced? What are the factors that facilitate it? What are the strategies that employees deploy to enable work-family enrichment? And what are the benefits or consequences of work-family enrichment?
The participants spoke freely about their experiences and gave a rich understanding of the phenomena. Firstly, the sample can be said to be belonging to upper middle class, all were educated and had children. Secondly, they reside in the cities and have access to modern gadgets and technology. The sample for qualitative study was purposive and was made as varied as possible to collect representative data.

The data gathered through interviews was subjected to content analysis as per the dictates of grounded research theory. The paradigm model of Strauss and Corbin (1990) was followed to understand work-family enrichment. As mentioned earlier, the Central themes were classified as phenomenon, causal factor, context, intervening factor, strategies employed and consequences.

Work-family enrichment is a bi-directional dimensional, having work-to-family and family-to-work as its domains. The participants acknowledged the positive as well as negative interdependencies of work and family. They also agreed that role performance in one domain helped in improving the role performance in the other. More importantly, the data correlated with the domains of Work-Family scale developed by Carlson, et al (2006). Overall, women experienced more work-family enrichment than men. Transfer of affect was the dominant sub-theme. The work-family enrichment model proposed by Greenhaus and Powell (2006) supports the finding. Besides, they are in accordance with the Role Accumulation theory of Sieber (1974) and the Expansionist hypothesis which states that people in multiple roles experience both advantages and disadvantages but the advantages are likely to prevail over the disadvantages (Baruch & Barnett, 1986). The ability to transfer resources from work-to-family and family-to-work is in line with previous research (Frone, 2003; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999) on positive work - family interdependencies.

The role of social resources was reiterated by the sample. Social support was received mainly from spouse, domestic help, parents, colleagues and boss. Both men and women reported receiving emotional support from the spouse. Men were found to participate in household chores to certain extent. This finds support to the fact that both partners participate in household chores where women are gainfully employed (Roy, 2003).Rajadhyaksha and Smita (2004) found in their survey that 32% of the husbands were willing in extending help, 22% of husbands helped occasionally while a majority did not extend help to their wives. In the present sample, while men reported giving instrumental support to their spouse, the women of the sample reported receiving
emotional support to a larger extent than instrumental. Apart from spouse, the family was an important source of support. Parents and in-laws formed the backbone of this support system. This is in congruence with the finding of Rajadhyaksha and Bhatnagar (2000) that in Indian context household help and child care support were the main ways in which instrumental family support was provided by elderly family members. Srivastava, Srivastava, & Srivastava (2009) reported that emotional support from family where the relationships are positive and pleasant enhanced work life positively. These relationships were also characterized by use of positive communication skills and positive affect.

Yet, some women expressed reservations and a feeling of guilt with respect to this support where the nature was instrumental. Rajadhyaksha and Ramadoss (2013) through their study have supported the finding that higher amounts of family support make a person increase his/her expectation to reciprocate that assistance leading to family-to-work conflict in Indian context.

Paid domestic help was an integral part of the dual earner families. The paid help was mostly from informal unorganized sector and this formed an important source of support but highly unreliable. The domestic help who was competent, trustworthy was highly prized. Also, good quality crèches were in large demands. The role of community resources in the experience of work-family enrichment needs to be focused on.

From the work place, support from boss and colleagues was sought and that played a part in work-family enrichment in line with Voydanoff’s study (2002). Employees reported welfare policies were important as they enabled them to manage work and family equally well; this is in line with the findings of Ezra and Deckman (1996). But, the employees spoke of the benefits being more as a response to statutory needs than to their own. The important issue was that of weekly off which was on a week day that really bothered the employees. Supportive work climate was more favorably viewed.

The context of the study referred to family, organization and cultural factors affecting the phenomenon of work-family enrichment. Earlier researches have pointed out the phenomenon of work-family experience to be a consequence of a combination of process, person, context and time characteristics (Bronfenbrenner, 1999; Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994). Participants came from nuclear and joint families;
though the majority were from nuclear. All participants had at least a child. Presence of
children was thought to bring positive effect to family lives that spilled over to work.
This is consistent with the Grzywacz and Marks (2000) study that reported that
individuals with children experienced positive spillover to a greater extent than those
who did not have children. The findings about work context are in support of the study
done by Baral and Bhargava (2011). They have also reported work-family culture,
supervisory support, job characteristics and perceived work-family balance policies as
predictors of work-to-family enrichment.

In terms of culture, religious beliefs of employees were found to be influencing
the high satisfaction levels at work provided they were adequately supported at their
work-place. Research has shown that where the organizations show flexible work
arrangements, so that individuals are able to integrate work and family responsibilities
in time and space it helps to promote work life balance (Bond, Galinsky, Lord, Staines,
Brown, 1998). In the study of Kalliath et al. (2007) besides support from family and
relatives, men and women in the study used religious rituals as coping strategies to deal
with work–family conflict.

There was gender role typing seen in the present study to certain extent where
females felt more responsible towards home and child care. Even in the west, women
were more engaged in household chores and child care duties than their spouses (Adema
& Whiteford, 2007).

The respondents’ narrative about their own personality description showed that
they were high on positive affect. Literature has found strong relationship between
positive affect and work-family enrichment (Michel & Clark, 2009). This can be
explained by affect colouring people’s perception about life stressors. Positive affect
makes an individual perceive the stressor as less threatening. Negative affect has been
positively associated with job and family strain which are predictors of work-family
conflict (Stoeva, Chiu, & Greenhaus, 2002).

Besides positivity, the sample called themselves extravert, enthusiastic, punctual,
multi-taskers, optimists and tough. Extravert is someone who is outgoing, active, as well
as energetic, enthusiastic and talkative (McCrae & John, 1998). The component of being
energetic and high on activity may be associated with work-family enrichment. Therefore, extraversion is related to work-family enrichment (Michel & Clark, 2009).
Being punctual and good time organizers can be seen as characteristics of people high on conscientiousness. Conscientiousness is found to be associated with work-family enrichment. Besides, optimism and resilience are related to work-family enrichment. The action-focused coping style found to be employed by the sample is agreed upon to be effective in problem solving; it also made the participants more optimistic. Optimism has been previously seen to be linked to positive work-family experience (Aryee et al., 2005).

Thus, in summary, the personal characteristics of the participants are potentially beneficial to the experience of work-family enrichment. Role salience was identified as an important factor affecting work-family enrichment. It is expected that when an individual cherishes a particular role, he is bound to invest his energy and effort in it therefore enhancing his chances of being successful in it (Carlson et al., 2006). Therefore, role salience may moderate the relationship between family resources and family-to-work enrichment. Role salience helps an individual to use the instrumental path to work-family enrichment as proposed by Greenhaus and Powell (2006).

Under the theme of building resource reservoir, the respondents said prioritizing, time management, learning of skills and adding new knowledge were relevant to achieve enriching lives. These strategies are the ones which have been reported in other researches, too. Srivastava et al., (2009) have also reported various skills like time management, self-confidence, planning capacity, communication skill, and decision making skill amongst others as being responsible for work-family facilitation. These strategies when used on a long term develop stable traits that can lead to work-family enrichment. The outcomes of work-family enrichment have been found in research as life satisfaction (Rashid et al., 2011) and work engagement (Klerk, Nel, & Koekemoer, 2015; Siu et al., 2010). This study also reiterates on similar lines.

4.6 SYNTHESIS

The present study included quantitative data and qualitative data for analyses and better understanding of work-family enrichment as related to social support and psychological capital. The quantitative phase consisted of working full time parents. From this same sample a smaller group that was willing to participate in the semi structured interviews was chosen to gather qualitative data. This section would integrate results from both types of analysis.
The present study revealed that availability of social support was not correlated with work-family enrichment and there was gender difference in terms of its predictive value towards PsyCap. PsyCap is a mediator in the relationship between support satisfaction and work-family enrichment in both genders. Since, the research design used was the mixed sequential explanatory design, it was possible to probe into these aspects.

The results obtained in the quantitative revealing that employees experienced bi-directional work-family enrichment, were amply supported in the qualitative revelation. The participants experienced enrichment along the domains predicted by the work-family enrichment scale of Carlson et al (2006). Employees could transfer new perspectives, skills, knowledge (Development); their work or family gave them a sense of contentment and success (Capital) and put them in positive mood (Affect) and increased their ability to focus on the work as the family is waiting back at home gave them a strong motivation to do so (Efficiency).

Additionally, there were narratives that viewed multiple role participation as part of one’s duty or Dharma and in order to get salvation one had to play the part well irrespective of what consequence it holds. Therefore, the individuals with this belief did not seem to be affected by what personal gains they were accumulating in work and family; and spoke in terms of inner peace and satisfaction that was not dependent on external factors. They viewed themselves as strong and unwavering in the face of difficulties. They attributed these philosophical leanings to their practice of their religion (Hinduism) like nishkam karma. Such thoughts can be said to be unique to the cultural canvass of India which has a rich tradition in Vedic literature and Bhagwad Geeta. These thoughts act as a deep-seated philosophy towards life and have power over an individual’s cognition and emotion. This shows the value of indigenous concepts for explaining psychological phenomena within specific cultural context. Such attempts in Indigenous psychology have been made in literature as seen in Paranjpe (1998) and Thomas, (1990) and more recently by Chakkarath (2001), but are scarce.

Similarly, the value of social support should be understood from the lens of socio-cultural perspective. The discussion of both quantitative as well as the qualitative data brings forth the following aspects (i) Availability of social support sources does not necessarily predict work-family enrichment. (ii) The qualitative data shows that no doubt, employees valued different sources of support in their lives from spouse, family,
work place and domestic help; but there were certain reservations expressed for each type.

The present sample consisted of 50% women and they came from nuclear families which comprised of husband, wife and children. The support from family source would be more as emotional support rather than instrumental support as they were separated by distance in time and place. Research indicates that support needs when not matched by support given leads to dissatisfaction.

Women in India still have to live with gendered role type so they take on the primary role of nurturer and home maker alongside being a full-time employee. Though men took pride in their women’s working status as it enhanced their self-image (Ramu, 1987), and participated in house work (Roy, 2003), yet it may not be equal to that of the women. The study done by Rajadhyaksha and Bhatnagar (2000) found that occupational role was more salient for men as compared to their wives. In spite of home maker and marital role thought to be important for both genders, the women were found to be more committed towards these roles. This finding has been further strengthened by the results that while men experience more work-spouse conflict, women experience work-parent conflict and work-housework conflict (Ramadoss & Rajadhyaksha, 2012). Additionally, employees have paid domestic help, which is mainly uneducated, from informal and unorganized sector.

Besides, with family, work colleagues and friends, the reciprocity aspect was stressed where in if the supportive exchange is perceived as equal or reciprocal, there is positive effect on well-being; but in case of under-reciprocity there is weak association and in case of over-reciprocity there is distress (Nahun-Shani, Bamberger, Bacharach, 2011).

In conclusion, the support sources available to the employees cannot be termed as unambiguous. Therefore, looking at the qualitative data, a case can be made that mere presence of support does not lead to work-family enrichment in the Indian cultural milieu. Similar findings have been found in extant literature in Indian context Rajadhyasha and Ramadoss (2013).

In the Support – PsyCap link where gender difference was found, the qualitative data shows that men have better access to social support sources at home and work.
They engage in all boys’ club, which gives them information, emotional support and provides positive affect. In the recent research of Ramadoss and Rajadhyaksha (2012), men reported significantly more support from boss, colleagues and extended family in managing both work and family responsibilities as compared to women. On the other hand, due to hierarchical patterns, there is power distance and woman may find themselves more with the same gender. Being a first generation working woman, she has less competent role models at work and home; hence the social support sources may not improve her PsyCap to the extent it is found in males.

Employees described themselves as positive, enthusiastic, strong and optimistic. These personality attributes helped them to function optimally in the environment as well as coloured their perceptions about life events thus leading to positive outcomes at work and family. Employees reported a central role for personal characteristics in their work-family experience. Employees stated that supportive others in one’s life can be of value, provided they themselves learnt and developed their competence over time. They felt primarily responsible for their goals. This dual emphasis on self and others can be explained taking into account the cultural dimension theory of Hofstede. According to Hofstede (2001), India’s score is moderate on individualism and it is one of the highest ranking South Asian countries on that dimension (Chakkarath, 2001). This is interpreted as Indians live in collectivistic as well as individualistic worlds. To elaborate it further, Indians want to be a part of a group and accept its influence over their personal life. Concurrently, they also give importance to self and being independent from others. This indicates that essentially Indians are driven by self-fulfillment of their personal goals but behaviorally they look dependent and want to be a part of their groups (Chakkarath, 2001). Hofstede (2001) further attributes this individualistic stance to the Hindu philosophy wherein it is believed that individuals are in a constant cycle of birth, death and rebirth. This cycle is based on an individual’s own Karma or actions in the present life. The investigator would like to add that this could be one of the explanations about how PsyCap acts as a mediator in social support and work-life enrichment in both genders.

As postulated by Conservation of Resources and Job Demands and Resources theory, employees view social support as a resource and engage in activities that lead to generation of more resources. They also experience positive affect leading to building of personal characteristics. The employees reported developing skills like time
management, prioritizing and scheduling, using leisure constructively, participating in social causes and being actively involved in various community groups made a big difference in enriching their lives. Besides, the benefits of work-family enrichment were expressed in terms of increasing quality of life, improving life satisfaction and work engagement.

4.7 SUMMARY

The present chapter presented both the data from the quantitative as well as the qualitative to enhance the understanding of work-family enrichment and the role played by perceived social support and PsyCap. The descriptive statistics showed the mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis values of the variables under study. An independent sample t-test was conducted to examine if the two genders differed on work-family enrichment. As there was a significant difference observed further analyses was conducted separately for men and women. The correlation analyses found that perceived social support availability was associated only with a few domains of PsyCap in both genders and it was not associated with work-family enrichment for both directions. While, perceived social support satisfaction was significantly associated with PsyCap its domains as well as with work-family enrichment. The results were explained using different perspectives and empirical evidences. The mediation role of PsyCap was tested using multiple hierarchical regressions. The hypotheses of mediation were supported in both genders. This implied that social support satisfaction enhanced work-family enrichment through PsyCap. There was a need felt to explore the reasons of the social support availability not being associated with PsyCap and work-family enrichment. This directed the qualitative study. The data from the qualitative analyses showed that participants had reservations about the varied sources available to them. It also revealed through the lived experiences of the participants the existence of the domains as specified in the work-family enrichment tool of Carlson et al., 2006. The personal characteristics was found to impact work-family enrichment through the descriptions that participants gave about themselves. Further when the data of the quantitative and qualitative were integrated it helped enhance the holistic understanding of work-family enrichment in the Indian context.