Work-Family Enrichment Theory

After many recommendations by scholars regarding the necessity of investigation beyond the long monotonous discussions on work-family conflict, Greenhaus and Powell developed the theory of work-family enrichment in 2006. This theoretical model of work-family enrichment was not only consistent with the first concept of the enrichment which was developed by Sieber (1974) and Marks (1977), but also went beyond it in two major issues. First, Greenhaus and Powell introduced a wider range of resources generated in one role that might be applied to another role. Specifically, five different classifications of resources (i.e. skills and perspectives, psychological and physical, social capital, flexibility, and material) were proposed in this theory. Second, Greenhaus and Powell developed the first idea by suggesting two different paths for the enrichment process, namely instrumental or direct path and affective or indirect path (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Figure 2 depicts this theory with the five categories of resource and the two enrichment paths.
The resources mentioned in this theory were categorized into five various types, including skills and perspectives, psychological and physical, social capital, flexibility, and material. Skills refer to task-related cognitive and interpersonal skills, coping skills, multitasking skills, and knowledge and wisdom derived from role experiences. Perspectives or worldview involve ways of perceiving or handling situations such as respecting individual differences or valuing differences in a cultural background, understanding other people’s problems, and finally learning the value of trust. The psychological and physical resources refer to positive self-evaluations such as self-efficacy, self-esteem or some other items, including personal hardiness, positive emotions about future, optimism and hope, and physical health. Social capital involves influence, information, and support, which are derived from interpersonal relationships in work and family roles. Flexibility refers to the ability and freedom of a person to determine the timing, pace and location at which role requirements are met. Finally, material resources refer to money and gifts obtained from work and family roles (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).
Moreover, in this theory, two paths were mentioned to describe the enrichment process based on Hanson and Hammer’s (2006) study, i.e. instrumental path and affective path. Instrumental path is related to the effective application of skills, abilities, and values from one role into another role (arrow 1 + arrow 6). Actually, instrumental path happens when the application of a resource, which has been generated in one role, has a direct effect on performance in another role. In Figure 2, the instrumental path is demonstrated by the arrow 1 and arrow 6. An example of the instrumental path occurs when an academic learns new skills to settle conflict down through training at work and applies that skill into the family domain to resolve conflicts with the children, spouse or other family members (arrow 1), and this issue would improve their family satisfaction and cohesion (arrow 6) (Pathak, 2011).

On the other hand, in affective path, affection or emotion is carried over from one role to another. This positive performance and affection in Role B may be produced through either high performance in Role A (arrow 3 + arrow 4 + arrow 5 + arrow 6) or positive emotions in Role A (arrow 2 + arrow 5 + arrow 6). In Figure 2, the affective path is demonstrated by the arrow 2,3,4,5, and arrow 6. An example of the affective path through positive emotions (arrow 2) is an academic who leaves family in a positive mood and because of that, he or she is more inclined to respond positively, with patience and joy, to his or her students, co-workers, or supervisor (arrow 5). Therefore, he or she could enhance his or her affection and performance as an academic (arrow 6) (Pathak, 2011).

Based on these paths, Tang et al. (2012) mentioned work-family enrichment as the best positive work-family construct. In other words, work-family enrichment theory captures the mechanism of the positive work-family interface comprehensively through instrumental and affective paths.

According to this theory, there are some moderators for these two paths. The moderators for instrumental path are salience of role B, perceived relevance of resource to role B, and consistency of resource with the requirements and norms of role B. For affective path, the involved moderator is only salience of role B. For instance, regarding salience of role B, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) argued that if a role were more salient to an individual, he or she would invest the more time, emotion, and the other available resources in the role, which would cause more enrichment.
In this study, some of the resources that were introduced by the theory of work-family enrichment were utilized as predictors of academics’ WFE. Extraversion and work centrality were employed from skills and perspectives category. Core self-evaluation and overall health were studied as psychological and physical resources. Social support was adopted from social capital resources category, and job autonomy and supportive family-friendly culture were from flexibility type resources. Whereas, material resources were not taken into account directly as one of the predictors of WFE, since there was not much difference of incomes between the academics of this study. Nevertheless, monthly gross income was considered as a control variable.

It is important to note that some of these resources even in different categories of resources are very similar to each other, and thus, it seems some of them could be placed in at least two categories. For instance, supportive work-family culture can be classified as either support or flexibility. According to Greenhaus and Powell (2006), various types of the resources are interdependent, and as a result, the acquisition of one resource can trigger the acquisition of other resources. Hence, the categorization of these resources could not be done accurately.

Besides the classification of resources used by Greenhaus and Powell (2006), other researchers have used different categorizations. As Table 2 shows, there are some other categorizations for resources on the work-family literature. For example, Mauno and Rantanen’s (2012) study focused on another categorization, which distinguished resources in two major categories, including contextual resources (e.g. social support) and dispositional resources (e.g. self-esteem). Mauno and Rantanen argued that a combination of high contextual resources with high dispositional resources showed the most positive outcomes for high WFE. However, previous studies typically just concentrated on one of those categories, and neglected their relative importance or their effects in combination on WFE (Mauno & Rantanen, 2012). Therefore, this current study had considered the relative importance of environmental (contextual) and personal (dispositional) resources of WFE. In addition, this categorization of resources by Mauno and Rantanen (2012) is consistent with the model of primary antecedents, consequences, and moderators of facilitation by Wayne et al. (2007).
The next section presents the model of primary antecedents, consequences, and moderators of facilitation by Wayne et al. (2007). Wayne et al.’s model was employed in this study because of two main reasons. First, this model uses a categorization of predictors (i.e. environmental and personal), which is known as the best categorization (Mauno & Rantanen, 2012). Second, this model suggests gender as a moderator in the relationships between antecedents of WFE and WFE. Further information about this model is given as follows.

### Model of Primary Antecedents, Consequences, and Moderators of Facilitation

To have a better understanding of the WFE resources, and to provide a theoretical foundation regarding the employment of gender as moderator, this study utilized the model of primary antecedents, consequences, and moderators of facilitation by Wayne et al. (2007). Figure 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher(s)</th>
<th>Number of Categories</th>
<th>Name of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qiu (2011)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Individual/ Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauno and Rantanen (2012)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Contextual/ Dispositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne et al. (2007)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personal Characteristics/ Environmental Resources (Energy resources, Support Resources, Condition Resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beutell and Wittig-Berman (2008)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Health-related/ Social Support/ Job-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenbergen et al. (2007)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Energy-based/Time-based/ Behavioural/Psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhaus and Powell (2006)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Social capital/ Flexibility/ Skills and Perspectives/ Psychological and Physical/ Material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shows the predictors of facilitation (i.e. personal characteristics and environmental resources), the moderators (e.g. gender, social class), and the outcomes (i.e. work and family). Specifically, Wayne et al.’s model distinguishes resources into two major categories, comprising environmental resources (e.g., social support) and personal resources (e.g., self-esteem). They argued that environmental resources (proposition 2) and personal characteristics (proposition 1) are key enablers of facilitation. Wayne et al. (2007) in their model stated that environmental factors are comprised of objects, conditions, energies, and support. These resources promote positive, dynamic, and enriching environments, which enable individuals to facilitate the functioning of another domain. In this definition, the objects are physical resources such as one's car, home, clothes, food, or other material goods. The energy resources, involving time, money, and knowledge aid in the acquisition of other resources. The conditions are such resources that are difficult to get, such as marriage, employment or seniority. Finally, the support, such as loyalty or intimacy, preserves other types of resources.
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**Figure 2: Model of Primary Antecedents, Consequences and Moderators of Facilitation**

Source: Wayne et al. (2007, p. 67)

Wayne et al. (2007) defined personal factors as “those traits or skills that result from one's orientation to the world” (p 66). In other words, personal factors are aspects of a person, which
encourage positivity, and affect an individual readily to experience positive emotional states. In other words, positive personal factors provoke individuals into seeking positive developmental experience and earning status and other assets. These changes or gains could lead to a better function in another life domain (work or family), and have influence over the work-family enrichment process.

Furthermore, the proposed resources of this model, which are divided into personal resources and environmental resources are consistent with Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) theory. Thus, social support, job autonomy, and supportive family-friendly culture in this study were categorized as environmental factors. Extraversion, work centrality, core self-evaluation, and overall health were classified under personal factors.

In respect of gender, Wayne et al. (2007) introduced gender as a demand characteristic of the individual. Demand characteristics, such as gender and social class, are associated to personality of individuals. In this model, Wayne et al. argued that although, in general, more availability and exploitability of resources would produce more enrichment, but demand characteristics such as gender would influence on the nature and strength of these relationships between resources and enrichment. For instance, when supportive work-family culture is provided in an organization, women as compared to men might more eagerly utilize it to produce more enrichment. Finally, they concluded that demand characteristics such as gender either directly influence the availability of environmental resources (proposition 3), and thereby influence the potential for facilitation, or moderate the relationship between environmental resources and facilitation (proposition 4). Based on this argument, this current study utilized gender as a moderator variable in the relationships between the antecedents and WFE.