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This study expands the work–family enrichment literature by integrating enrichment theory (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), social–cognitive theory (Bandura, 2001), capitalization theory (e.g., Gable, Reis, Impett, & Asher, 2004), and creative cognition theory (e.g., Smith, Ward, & Finke, 1995), in order to advance a novel conceptual model of the effects of resource transfer training on enrichment and job satisfaction. The model was tested by developing and evaluating a work-to-family enrichment training program, the Resource Transfer Training, which was based on Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) enrichment theory and interpersonal capitalization theory (Ilies, Keeney, & Scott, 2011). The training was administered to 163 administrative employees using a longitudinal prepost experimental design. Consistent with hypotheses, findings indicated that, compared to a control training condition, the Resource Transfer Training increased development-based enrichment from work to family (the transfer of skills, knowledge and values). Furthermore, the effect of the training on both development-based and affect-based enrichment (the transfer of positive affect) was mediated by enrichment self-efficacy, and the indirect effects of the training on enrichment were moderated by initial social–emotional work resources. Finally, enrichment self-efficacy and enrichment experiences sequentially mediated the effect of the training on job satisfaction. This work advances theory by demonstrating that human agency can facilitate enrichment experiences across roles, and by exploring new antecedents of enrichment through theoretically driven training components. It advances practice by devising and testing a work-to-family enrichment intervention that can serve as a tool for organizations to increase positive synergy between work and nonwork roles.
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Work–family research and practice have predominantly focused on experiences of conflict between roles (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). However, researchers have also acknowledged that work and family roles may facilitate one another (Frone, 2003), and that experiences in one role can improve the quality of life in another role (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Meta-analytic findings (McNall, Nicklin, & Masuda, 2010) confirm the value of work–family enrichment, and research demonstrates that work–family enrichment contributes to the prediction of work and nonwork outcomes, over and above conflict (van Steenbergen, Ellemers, & Mooij, 2007). Thus, the development of a positive and valuable synergy across life roles is paramount for individuals’ performance and well-being. The present study addressed this need by introducing an individual-based training intervention, called Resource Transfer Training, to increase effective resource transfer from work roles to family roles.

The current work draws from Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) enrichment theory, which holds that experiences in one role lead to the acquirement of resources, resulting in improved performance in the other role. The theory specifies an instrumental path to enrichment, where skills, values, and psychological resources are transferred across roles, hence improving performance in the receiving role (e.g., skills nurtured at work, such as active listening, can improve parenting; Crouter, 1984). The theory also includes an affective path, where

© Ravit Heskiau, Management and Organizational Development Group, D’Amore McKim School of Business, Northeastern University; Julie M. McCarthy, Department of Management, Rotman School of Management, University of Toronto Scarborough.

This work is based on Ravit Heskiau’s dissertation; an early version was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management in Chicago, Illinois, August, 2018. This research was supported by a research grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada awarded to Julie M. McCarthy (435-2015-0220). We thank Gary Latham and Geoffrey Leonardelli for their helpful suggestions on study design.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ravit Heskiau, Management and Organizational Development Group, D’Amore McKim School of Business, Northeastern University, 120 Hayden Hall, 360 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA 02115-5000. E-mail: r.heskiau@northeastern.edu
resource accumulation in a role increases one’s positive affect, which enhances psychological availability (Rothbard, 2001), and increases cognitive, task, and interpersonal functioning, as well as persistence in the other role (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). To date, most of the central theories of work–family enrichment focus on the generation and accumulation of resources for transfer to the other role (Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson, & Kacmar, 2007). Moreover, empirical work on the antecedents of work–family enrichment has mostly emphasized personal characteristics, such as the Big Five (Wayne, Musica, & Fleeson, 2004), as well as environmental factors, such as job characteristics (Grzywacz & Butler, 2005). Thus, despite the importance of work–family enrichment, we know little about factors that enhance the transferability of resources across domains. To fill this gap, the present study focuses on the process of resource mobilization, rather than resource accumulation, across roles. This is accomplished by drawing from social–cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986) to design a training intervention expected to increase enrichment self-efficacy. Emphasizing that people are active agents in shaping their environment (Bandura, 2001), this perspective is congruent with the idea that employees can intentionally promote enrichment in their lives. In line with enrichment theory, our training was designed to enhance both development-based enrichment (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006) and affective enrichment (the transfer of positive affect).

The present work advances theory and research in several ways. First, we expand work–family enrichment theory by adopting an agentic approach and shifting attention to resource transfer across roles, rather than only considering resource gain. Furthermore, we integrate enrichment theory (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), social–cognitive theory (Bandura, 2001), capitalization theory (Gable et al., 2004), and creative cognition theory (Smith et al., 1995) in order to develop a coherent conceptual model of resource transfer training that bridges these separate research areas. Second, this study involved the development, implementation, and testing of a training program designed to increase work-to-family enrichment. This type of program is invaluable for boosting employee well-being, especially since individual-based work–family interventions are scarce and underdeveloped (Hammer, Densky, Kossek, & Bray, 2016). Third, this work utilized a field experiment. Experimental designs are important but relatively rare in the work–family literature, which is largely based on cross-sectional research (Hammer et al., 2016).

Conceptual Model of Work-to-Family Resource Transfer Training

Our theoretically derived conceptual model begins with the effects of Resource Transfer Training on enrichment (see Figure 1). Our goal was to develop a comprehensive training program that would promote beneficial transfer of resources from the work to the family domain, that is, work-to-family enrichment. Recent definitions of the positive interdependencies between work and family distinguish among individual enhancement, positive spillover, and work–family enrichment (Wayne, 2009). Individual enhancement is the acquisition of different benefits or gains within a certain life domain through engagement in that domain. In contrast, positive spillover happens when gains acquired in one domain are transferred to/used in another domain but does not necessarily mean that the gains improve performance or quality of life in the other domain. Enrichment pertains to the transfer of a broad set of resources, which enables the individual to function more effectively in the receiving role. In the present study, the focus is on the most inclusive outcome—enrichment. As such, our enrichment training program, the Resource Transfer Training, was developed by drawing from Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) enrichment theory to develop training elements that would promote development-based enrichment, and from capitalization theory (Gable et al., 2004) to develop elements that would promote affective enrichment. In addition, the Resource Transfer Training was designed to enhance work-to-family enrichment through a bundle of four core theoretical components.

Component 1: Acknowledgment of Work-Related Resources

Opportunities that allow resource gain at work (e.g., computer skills) are one of the most commonly studied antecedents of work-to-family enrichment (Carlson et al., 2006). However, in order to enact enrichment, it is essential to first identify such resources. When individuals explicitly acknowledge their strengths at work, they become aware of the benefits of specific resources. This is aligned with powerful psychology interventions (Seligman, Steen, Park, & Peterson, 2005). Thus, component 1 focuses on the acknowledgment of work-related resources.

Component 2: Conceptualization of Work-Related Resources

This component marks the transition from acquired work resources to the transfer across domains. Here, conceptualizing work resources at high level is important for promoting cross-domain transfer. For example, abstract relations between situations, rather than concrete automatic ones, facilitate transfer of learning (Bereiter, 1997). Similarly, when work resources are conceptualized at a high level (e.g., “This value guides me as a person”), rather than at a lower level (e.g., “This value guides me in this work task”), they can be de-situated from the work context, which increases the chances of perceiving them as relevant outside of work. This is consistent with the creative cognition lens (Smith et al., 1995), which suggests that creativity is the process of combining existing knowledge sets that might initially seem unrelated. Similarly, resource transfer across work and family roles can be seen as the ability to recognize connections between otherwise distinct domains. Since the process of generating novel ideas is considered to benefit from abstract thinking (Ward, 1995), high-level conceptualization can also promote enrichment.

Component 3: Generating Positive Connections Across Roles

This component focuses on the transfer of developmental and affective resources. For developmental resources, Greenhaus and

---

1 Our focus was on the work-to-family direction because research indicates that resource transfer is less prevalent in this direction (e.g., Grzywacz & Marks, 2000) and because we anticipated that it would be easier to apply work-related resources to family life due to greater flexibility.
family enrichment: have a total/overall positive effect on the experience of work-to-home—from acquired resources, through resource transfer, to related resources at home. It integrates all of the steps to enriching the steps required to perform a task, including successful performance (Neck & Manz, 1992). Latham and Seijts (1997) advocated the integration of mental practice to advance transfer of training, and meta-analytic findings support its usefulness for both physical and cognitive tasks (Driskell, Copper, & Moran, 1994). Thus, mental practice was incorporated into our training in order to increase confidence in one’s ability to capitalize on one’s work-related resources at home. It integrates all of the steps to enrichment by visualizing the process of benefiting from work resources at home—from acquired resources, through resource transfer, to successful outcomes.

Combined, these four theoretical components were expected to have a total/overall positive effect on the experience of work-to-family enrichment:

Component 4: Mental Practice

Mental practice is the process of creating a cognitive experience that resembles a “real world” one (Finke, 1989). It involves visualizing the steps required to perform a task, including successful performance (Neck & Manz, 1992). Latham and Seijts (1997) advocated the integration of mental practice to advance transfer of training, and meta-analytic findings support its usefulness for both physical and cognitive tasks (Driskell, Copper, & Moran, 1994). Thus, mental practice was incorporated into our training in order to increase confidence in one’s ability to capitalize on one’s work-related resources at home. It integrates all of the steps to enrichment by visualizing the process of benefiting from work resources at home—from acquired resources, through resource transfer, to successful outcomes.

Combined, these four theoretical components were expected to have a total/overall positive effect on the experience of work-to-family enrichment:

$H1$: Resource Transfer Training increases work-to-family enrichment experiences (development-based and affect-based), such that trained employees experience higher levels of work-to-family enrichment than employees in a control group.

Our model also proposes self-efficacy as a training-related mechanism by which Resource Transfer Training has an effect on enrichment. Self-efficacy reflects one’s judgment of the likelihood that one can execute desired courses of action (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacy beliefs raise expectations for success, motivation, and eventually performance (Bandura, 1990, 2000). Self-efficacy beliefs have been modestly studied in the context of work–family balance (Basuil & Casper, 2012). Furthermore, these studies have focused on the prevention of conflict and do not include beliefs regarding enrichment across domains. We extend existing knowledge and define work-to-family enrichment self-efficacy as individuals’ perception of their ability to use resources developed in work roles in order to improve performance and well-being in family roles. Work-to-family enrichment self-efficacy should lead to the application of resources across domains, and hence predict work-to-family enrichment experiences.

The theories on which our training builds are aligned with enrichment self-efficacy, as they are consistent with an agentic approach to enrichment. Specifically, Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) model emphasizes conscious and proactive decision-making processes that lead individuals to transfer developmental resources across life domains. Similarly, interpersonal capitalization theory (Gable et al., 2004; Ilies et al., 2015) highlights the intentional capitalization on positive events, or affective resources, in order to savor and increase the benefits from them. Therefore, integrating this approach into the training emphasizes that the transfer of affective resources can also be controlled by the individual. Research has shown the important role of self-efficacy in motivating proactive behavior and initiative due to the centrality of self-efficacy beliefs as a mechanism of personal agency (Ouyang, Cheng, Lam, & Parker, 2019). Given that enrichment requires employees to proactively recognize and mobilize resources, and hence go beyond the prevention of conflict, self-efficacy is likely to be a valuable predictor of enrichment experiences.
An agentic approach is also central to training programs, and research has positioned self-efficacy as an antecedent of training effectiveness (Sitzmann & Weinhardt, 2018; Stajkovic, Bandura, Locke, Lee, & Sergent, 2018; Talsma, Schüiz, Schwarzer, & Norris, 2018). This is because self-efficacy facilitates the translation of knowledge and abilities acquired in training into performance (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). In the case of our Resource Transfer Training, employees learn how to transfer work-based developmental and affective resources to the family/home domain. Furthermore, they practice the application of these resources and thus become more confident that they are able to find cross-role connections and achieve synergy between their roles. Specifically, our training program incorporated the enhancement of enrichment self-efficacy through three of the core components identified by Bandura (1997): enactive mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, and verbal persuasion. Enactive mastery experiences were enhanced by providing participants with opportunities to make their own connections between developmental and affective resources and family situations, as well as visualize a successful transfer using mental practice. Vicarious experiences were enhanced through concrete examples of other employees enacting enrichment, successfully employing the discussed strategies and transferring the specific types of resources. Verbal persuasion was accomplished through guidance, encouragement, and emphasis on the variety of possibilities for enrichment. Thus, we propose the following:

H2a: Resource Transfer Training increases work-to-family enrichment self-efficacy.

H2b: Work-to-family enrichment self-efficacy is positively related to work-to-family enrichment experiences (development-based and affect-based).

H2c: Work-to-family enrichment self-efficacy mediates the positive effect of Resource Transfer Training on work-to-family enrichment experiences (development-based and affect-based).

The second portion of our model considers how Resource Transfer Training is related to job satisfaction. The source attribution perspective (Shockley & Singla, 2011) posits that affective consequences of enrichment, such as satisfaction, are more likely to occur in the originating domain that provides the source of enrichment, which in this case is the work domain. When employees perceive that their job enriches their nonwork life, they are likely to feel supported and grateful (Aryee, Srinivas, & Tan, 2005). In response, employees may reciprocate with favorable attitudes toward work (Wayne, Randel, & Stevens, 2006). Indeed, meta-analytic findings (Shockley & Singla, 2011) demonstrated that work-to-family enrichment has a stronger positive relation with job satisfaction than with family satisfaction. Enrichment experiences may also increase the perceived meaningfulness of one’s job (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). In turn, perceived meaningfulness of the job is expected to increase satisfaction with one’s job (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Hence, we hypothesize the following:

H3a: Work-to-family enrichment (development-based and affect-based) is positively related to job satisfaction.

H3b: Work-to-family enrichment self-efficacy and enrichment experiences (development-based and affect-based) sequentially mediate the effect of Resource Transfer Training on job satisfaction.

The final portion of our model focuses on moderation by combining work-to-family enrichment training with “traditional” predictors of enrichment in the form of resource gain opportunities at work (Carlson et al., 2006). Work role resources include developmental resources such as negotiation skills, affective resources such as positive emotions, and psychological-based resources such as self-efficacy beliefs. We expect the training to be more effective for employees perceiving low levels of work resources at baseline. This is because individuals who initially perceive a low level of resources have more potential for improvement. This pattern is consistent with findings in past work-family intervention research (Hammer, Kossek, Anger, Bodner, & Zimmerman, 2011; Odle-Dusseau, Hammer, Crain, & Bodner, 2016), where employees who benefitted from a family friendly intervention were those who needed it the most. Other interventions have shown a similar pattern—that individuals who are the worst off to begin with benefit the most (Stinson, Logel, Shepherd, & Zanna, 2011). Since employees perceiving a low level of resources are expected to benefit more in terms of increased confidence in their ability to effectively transfer resources, self-efficacy is expected to mediate the interaction between training and initial work role resources on enrichment. Thus,

H4: Resource Transfer Training and work-role resources have an indirect interaction effect on work-to-family enrichment (development-based and affect-based) via enrichment self-efficacy, such that the effect of training is stronger as individuals initially perceive less resources.

Method

Participants

The sample included 163 administrative employees at a large North American university. Participants were included in the final sample if they had completed at least half of the two separate 20-min training sessions. The average age was 43.16 (SD = 10.54), and approximately 82% of the sample were female. Participants had been working on average 6.15 years (SD = 4.26) in their current job, with an average of 39.20 (SD = 9.06) weekly work hours. Sixty-six percent of the participants lived with a domestic partner, 19.1% were single, 9.3% were divorced, 5% were separated, and 0.6% was widowed. In addition, 54.3% had children.2

Study Design and Procedure

The study was completed online and employed a longitudinal prepost experimental design. Employees completed pretest mea-

---

2 The relation between self-efficacy and performance is complex, as illustrated in the conceptual model advanced by Vancouver and Purl (2017), wherein the two constructs demonstrate a reciprocal relation.

3 This study was approved by the Research Ethics Board (REB) at the University of Toronto (Protocol ID: 31511). See Supplemental Appendix B for more details on the sample.
Each program incorporated the four theoretical components as “the four-step technique.”4 Participants were instructed to go through a four-step technique to improve their work–family enrichment. Sessions were approximately 20 min long and consisted of animated PowerPoint slides with voice-over. Sessions were approximately three weeks later (Time 4). See Figure 2 for more details.

To our knowledge, no established work–family enrichment/positive transfer training exists. Thus, to conduct a rigorous test of the hypotheses, we went beyond a no-training or wait-list control condition and designed an equivalent control training based on sleep, exercise, and nutrition. This content was chosen because, similarly to the experimental training, it is relevant to managing everyday life and personal resources at work and home. Health and lifestyle training interventions are also commonly used in organizations for improving well-being and work outcomes (e.g., Barnes, Miller, & Bostock, 2017). The control training was also structurally equivalent to the experimental training and was delivered by the same trainer.

Each training program (Resource Transfer and control) included two separate online sessions composed of animated PowerPoint slides with voice-over. Sessions were approximately 20 min long and contained interactive questions and application exercises. Sessions were equivalent across the two conditions in terms of length, number of slides, structure, instructor, and number of questions. Each program incorporated the four theoretical components as “the four-step technique.”4 Participants were instructed to go through the steps daily to generate application ideas and facilitate training application (Kossek, Hammer, Kelly, & Moen, 2014).

### Measures

Unless otherwise noted, items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale that ranged from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Internal consistency reliabilities for all measures were strong (see Table 1). Development-based work-to-family enrichment (three items) and affect-based work-to-family enrichment (three items) were measured with Carlson et al.’s (2006) scale. Work-to-family enrichment self-efficacy was measured with a 10-item domain-specific measure that was created based on Chen, Gully, and Eden’s (2001) general self-efficacy items (see Appendix).5 Job satisfaction was measured with the six-item version (taken from Fields, 2002) of the measure developed by Brayfield and Rothe (1951). For work role resources, participants indicated the extent to which they acquired or developed each of 12 different types of resources on their job. The list of resources was compiled based on the categorization offered by Greenhaus and Powell (2006). Two scales were created: social-emotional resources and task-related resources (see Table 3 in the online supplemental materials). Sleep was assessed with two items modified from the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (Buysse, Reynolds, Monk, Berman, & Kupfer, 1989). Furthermore, two items were created to assess exercise and two for nutrition. The lifestyle self-efficacy measure contained 10 items measuring the extent to which participants perceived that they were able to successfully use sleep, exercise, and nutrition to replenish their resources (see Appendix). Finally, on a 5-point scale, participants completed a workshop evaluation and rated the extent to which they found the workshop interesting, informative, engaging, and enjoyable.

### Results

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Tables 1 and 2. To test our hypotheses, path analyses using full

Figure 2. Detailed study procedure. RTT = Resource Transfer Training; C = control training. We measured sleep, exercise and nutrition throughout the study to increase the equivalence between the training conditions, as these measures were directly related to the control training the way the work-family enrichment measure was related to the Resource Transfer Training. This enabled us to evaluate potential experimental threats, such as demand characteristics. For Time 2, qualified means that participants satisfied the inclusion criteria after the training (see Supplemental Appendix B). All participants included in the posttest analyses qualified after the training, that is, satisfied the inclusion criteria.

---

4 Supplemental Table 1 describes the experimental and control programs. Supplemental Table 2 describes the four-step technique in detail.

5 Supplemental Appendix C details the two parts of a validation study we conducted to support the psychometric properties of the measure (also approved by REB at the University of Toronto; Protocol ID# 36432).
## Table 1

**Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities**

| Variable                          | M    | SD   | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 19  | 20  | 21  | 22  | 23  |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Resource Transfer Training        |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Task-related work resources       | 5.43 | 1.08 | .00 | .88 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Social–emotional work resources   | 4.59 | 1.33 | .02 | .93 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Dev.-based enrichment T1          | 4.52 | 1.31 | .03 | .93 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Affect-based enrichment T1        | 4.21 | 1.60 | .04 | .97 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Sleep T1                          | 3.88 | 1.28 | .03 | .84 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Exercise T1                       | 4.21 | 1.51 | .17 | .87 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Nutrition T1                      | 5.04 | 1.09 | .02 | .81 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Workshop evaluation T2           | 3.21 | 0.84 | .02 | .82 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Enrichment self-efficacy T2      | 4.99 | 1.01 | .26 | .96 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Sleep T3                          | 4.13 | 1.22 | .03 | .83 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Exercise T3                       | 4.48 | 1.38 | .16 | .84 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Nutrition T3                      | 5.18 | 0.99 | .02 | .82 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Dev.-based enrichment T4          | 4.81 | 1.30 | .29 | .95 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Affect-based enrichment T4        | 4.49 | 1.53 | .13 | .97 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Sleep T4                          | 4.20 | 1.15 | .01 | .84 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Exercise T4                       | 4.55 | 1.35 | .20 | .84 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Nutrition T4                      | 5.16 | 1.11 | .02 | .83 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Job satisfaction T4               | 4.91 | 1.38 | .05 | .94 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

**Note.**  
N = 110–163. The entries on the diagonal are inter-item reliability coefficients. Dev. = development. T1 = Time 1; T2 = Time 2; T3 = Time 3; T4 = Time 4.  
*a 0 = control, 1 = Resource Transfer Training.  
*Measured on a 5-point scale; all others measured on a 7-point scale.  
*p < .05.  **p < .01 (two-tailed).
information maximum likelihood estimation were conducted in MPlus. Bootstrapping with 5,000 samples was employed to construct 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals (Shrout & Bolger, 2002). Pretest enrichment served as a control for all outcome variables, to test for the hypothesized effects over and above baseline enrichment levels (e.g., Sitzmann & Yeo, 2013). The model was estimated twice, for enrichment at Time 3 and Time 4.

For the sake of parsimony, findings for enrichment at Time 3 are reported here (see Tables 3 and 4 and Figures 3 and 4), and findings for enrichment at Time 4 are detailed in Supplemental Tables 6 and 7.6,7

Hypotheses 1 and 2 focused on the effects of the training on posttraining enrichment. Results are described in Table 4 and Figure 3. The overall effect of the training on enrichment (H1) is represented by the total effect (direct + indirect). The total effect of the Resource Transfer Training on development-based enrichment experiences was positive and significant (B = .36, p = .01).8 As shown in Supplemental Table 6, this effect was larger at T4 (B = .58, p < .001). However, the training did not have a significant overall effect on affect-based enrichment (B = .19, p = .22). Hence, H1 is supported for development-based enrichment only.9 Consistent with H2a, Resource Transfer Training participants reported higher levels of enrichment self-efficacy compared to the control group (B = .50, p = .001). In support of H2b, enrichment self-efficacy was positively related to development-based enrichment (B = .38, p < .001), as well as to affect-based enrichment (B = .29, p = .001). See Table 3. Finally, in support of H2c, the indirect effect of the training on development-based enrichment through enrichment self-efficacy was positive and significant (B = .19, p < .01), as was the effect on affect-based enrichment (B = .15, p = .02).

Hypothesis 3 considered job satisfaction as an outcome variable. As shown in Table 3, findings supported H3a, such that development-based enrichment was positively related to job satisfaction (B = .26, p = .02), as was affect-based enrichment (B = .28, p < .01). Hypothesis 3b stated that enrichment self-efficacy and enrichment experiences would sequentially mediate the positive effect of the training on job satisfaction. As shown in Table 4, the indirect effect through development-based and affect-based enrichment was significant (B = .09, p = .02, CI [.03, .22]).

Our final hypothesis focused on the extent to which initial work resources would moderate the effect of the training on enrichment through enrichment self-efficacy (H4). We adopted a conservative approach and tested both resource factors simultaneously as moderators of the training effects. The continuous moderators were grand mean centered. As shown in Table 3, task-related resources did not moderate the effect of the training on enrichment self-efficacy (B = .15, p = .43), but social–emotional resources did (B = .36, p = .02; see Figure 4). The conditional indirect effects on enrichment (via enrichment self-efficacy) were consistent and are presented in Table 4. For task-related resources, the indirect interaction effect on development-based enrichment was not significant (B = .06, p = .44), nor was the effect on affect-based enrichment (B = .04, p = .45). However, the interaction between the training and initial social–emotional resources significantly predicted development-based enrichment via enrichment self-efficacy (B = -.14, p = .04). Similarly, the interaction effect on affect-based enrichment approached significance, with the confidence interval excluding zero (B = -.11, p = .06, CI [-.29, -.01]). Simple slopes analysis for the moderation of the indirect training effect revealed a pattern consistent with our expectations (see Table 4): Among employees initially low on

6 Results for the models with enrichment at Time 3 and Time 4 were similar. The only exception was that the training had a direct effect on development-based enrichment at Time 4 only. Furthermore, all findings replicate when marital status is controlled.

7 Results for participants who completed the training in full are presented in Supplemental Appendix B, Tables 11–14. Results were similar.

8 The total effect is equivalent to a MANOVA or regression examining the effect of training on enrichment while controlling for T1 enrichment.

9 Hypothesis 1 was also tested using the Time × Condition effect in a mixed-model repeated-measures MANOVA, and the results replicated.
Direct Effects of Resource Transfer Training on Time 2 Enrichment Self-Efficacy, Time 3 Enrichment, and Time 4 Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>DV = Enrichment self-efficacy</th>
<th>DV = Development-based enrichment</th>
<th>DV = Affect-based enrichment</th>
<th>DV = Job satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development-based enrichment T1*</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect-based enrichment T1*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Transfer Training</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrichment self-efficacy</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development-based enrichment T3</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect-based enrichment T3</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related work resources</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social–emotional work resources</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Transfer Training × Task-Related Work Resources</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Transfer Training × Social–Emotional Work</td>
<td>−.36*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Model is based on full information maximum likelihood estimation. \( N = 163 \). The training was coded 0 = control, 1 = Resource Transfer Training. \( B = \) unstandardized parameter estimates, \( SE = \) standard error. T1 = Time 1, T3 = Time 3.

*To provide a conservative test of our hypotheses, we controlled for the effects of Time 1 development-based and affect-based enrichment on Time 2 enrichment self-efficacy, Time 3 development and affect-based enrichment (respectively), and Time 4 job satisfaction. \( \Delta R^2 \) of enrichment self-efficacy when the training is added to a model with only controls is .05; \( \Delta R^2 \) of T3 development-based enrichment when the training is added to a model including only controls is .03 (.04 for T4). \( \Delta R^2 \) of T3 affect-based enrichment when the training is added to a model including only controls is .004.

\(* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.\)

Discussion

The goal of this research was to examine intentional resource transfer from work to family roles. Findings provided support for our conceptual model, and demonstrated that our Resource Transfer Training program was effective in increasing enrichment self-efficacy, which was in turn related to enrichment experiences. The Resource Transfer Training also had a positive total effect on development-based enrichment, which held 10 days, as well as a month, after the end of the training. Overall, these results support the notion that enrichment from work to family roles can be enhanced by increasing self-efficacy beliefs, and that this can be done with an employee-focused training program.

In line with our theoretical model, this study also provided evidence that our training exhibited an indirect effect on job satisfaction through enrichment self-efficacy and enrichment experiences. This finding extends the outcomes of the training beyond enrichment-related outcomes. Furthermore, findings replicate the relationship between both types of enrichment and job satisfaction (Shockley & Singla, 2011). These findings are important given the large volume of research on job satisfaction and its established relations with important employee and organizational outcomes (Judge, Weiss, Kammerer-Mueller, & Hulin, 2017). Thus, Resource Transfer Training could be used as a basis for multiple short-term training programs or one-time more comprehensive programs, both of which may have long-term effects on job satisfaction.

This study also tested the moderating effect of initial work resources on the training’s indirect effect on enrichment. Results indicated that the indirect effects depended on initial perceived social–emotional resources. Consistent with past findings of work–family interventions (Hammer et al., 2011), employees initially perceiving a low level of social–emotional work resources benefited more from the training through increased enrichment self-efficacy. Future research could attempt to replicate these findings in low-resource occupations or jobs. Future work could also examine social/environmental moderators, for example, how managers or family members encourage or hinder application of resources in the receiving domain.

Finally, it is noteworthy that while the Resource Transfer Training exhibited a total effect on development-based enrichment, it did not do so for affect-based enrichment. This may be due to the fact that development-based enrichment is more central to the concept of enrichment. There are also a greater variety of development-based resources, and these are more connected to engagement at work. As such, the training may have inherently put more emphasis on the transfer of developmental resources. In light of these findings, future research could aim to better understand the contribution of the current training’s components. Such studies could investigate the relationship between each component and enrichment through focused “mini interventions.”

Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions

This study has several notable strengths, as well as associated limitations. First, while the use of self-reports is aligned with the subjective nature of enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), it raises concerns of demand characteristics and common method variance. Demand characteristics may have occurred with respect to the training’s evaluation, as participants may have been aware of the training’s evaluation, as participants may have been aware of...
the training’s goals. However, this concern is reduced given that unlike development-based enrichment, no overall effect of the training was detected on affect-based enrichment. Furthermore, the control group was also prone to demand characteristics, and yet no significant differences on participants’ ratings of sleep, exercise, and nutrition across the two groups were found (see Supplemental Tables 8–10). Moreover, the concern for common-method variance is reduced given that the core study variables were measured at different points in time. That said, future research would benefit from posttraining evaluations that assess participants’ actual resource transfer and outcomes over time, as well as obtaining family member ratings. Future work could also develop a behavioral measure of enrichment based on active resource transfer. An additional design-related limitation is our inability to empirically establish causal paths from self-efficacy to enrichment to job satisfaction.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV = Job satisfaction</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CI(BC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>[-0.58, 1.29]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Path analysis results for testing Hypotheses 1 to 4 (enrichment measured at Time 3). Control variables included development-based enrichment at T1 and affect-based enrichment at T1. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

Figure 4. Moderation of the Resource Transfer Training effect on enrichment self-efficacy by initial social–emotional work resources.
satisfaction. Future research could manipulate the mediator and observe its effects on enrichment as per the recommendations by Stone-Romero and Rosopa (2011). Finally, future research could examine a family-to-work Resource Transfer Training, assessing training effectiveness through objective workplace indicators and coworkers’ or managers’ reports.

Second, this study compared the Resource Transfer Training to a lifestyle training control, which was carefully designed to balance methodological, practical, and ethical considerations (Street & Luoma, 2002). As an equivalent and active control, the lifestyle training enabled a more rigorous test of our hypotheses compared to a no-training/wait-list condition. The control program was also advantageous because its content was relevant to employee well-being and work–life outcomes. Furthermore, there was no difference in participants’ evaluation of the two programs. Thus, differences in outcomes across the conditions are unlikely to be due to participants viewing one program as more attractive. At the same time, the control training focused on a different topic, which may have contributed to attritional differences between the two groups. For example, despite the positive tone, the control training did not emphasize positive emotions and did not focus on integration across life areas. This may have increased the possibility of demand characteristics. However, this concern is reduced as discussed above.

Third, only a portion of the initial participants were included in the final sample. Therefore, it is possible that self-selection through the stages interfered with random assignment to conditions, thus decreasing internal validity. However, comparisons between the groups in the final sample showed no differences in demographic and pretest variables (except for exercise), and analyses revealed that the two conditions were equivalent in terms of the participants who were included in the final sample versus those who were not (see Supplemental Tables 4 and 5).

Conclusion

This study advances and tests a conceptual model of Resource Transfer Training that can serve as a valuable foundation for future research. By applying social–cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986) and examining enrichment-related self-efficacy, we provide evidence for the role of personal agency in the process of interrole enrichment. This is a sharp contrast from the past focus on accumulation of resources. Our comprehensive model also addresses proximal, as well as more remote, outcomes of the training, and the examination of development-based and affect-based enrichment enabled a more nuanced understanding of the training effects. Our findings highlight the value of Resource Transfer Training for enhancing development-based enrichment, and the need for novel techniques that will enhance the transfer of affective resources.

Managing the work–family interface remains a central challenge for employees. Despite an abundance of work–family research, there is a need for effective, theory-driven, and rigorously tested interventions (Hammer et al., 2016). The work–family literature has focused on policy-based solutions, such as flexible work and dependent care programs. While these are invaluable, it is essential to offer employees skills to achieve balance. This study offers a relatively simple and accessible practice that does not involve complex policies, considerable organizational investment, or job redesign. Enhancing positive synergy between employees’ work and family roles is also valuable from an organizational and societal perspective, as it can promote worker well-being (McNall et al., 2010). Given that these benefits are expected over and above those of reducing work–family conflict (van Steenbergen et al., 2007), it would be worthwhile to direct resources toward promoting enrichment in addition to policies for ameliorating interference.
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Appendix

Measures

Work-to-Family Enrichment Self-Efficacy Scale
I can effectively use resources developed at work to enhance my home routine.
I will be successful at making things I learn at work useful at home.
I am sure I will be able to effectively use ideas from work to help me at home.
Even when it seems difficult, I am certain that I can accomplish more at home using skills and knowledge from work.
I believe I can succeed at being a better family member using my work experiences.
I will be able to take advantage of a good day at work to improve my home functioning.
I will be able to overcome challenges related to the successful application of work-related resources to my family role.
Compared to other people, I can successfully capitalize on work experiences to be a better family member.
Even when it seems tough, I can leverage resources acquired at work to gain more in my family role.

Lifestyle Self-Efficacy Scale
I can effectively use sleep, exercise and nutrition to enhance my routine.
When I try, I will be successful at keeping a high sleep quality.
I am sure I can integrate physical activity into my life.
Even when it seems difficult, I am certain that I can replenish my resources during work hours.
I believe I can succeed at being physically active on a regular basis.
I plan to take advantage of a good night sleep to function well.
If needed, I will be able to overcome challenges related to healthy nutrition.
I am confident that if I decide so, I can effectively take advantage of my rest and respite time.
Compared to other people, I can successfully capitalize on different opportunities to get exercise.
Even when it seems tough, I can make good nutrition choices.

Sleep Scale (items are from the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index, Buysse et al., 1989)
How often have you had trouble sleeping?
How would you rate your sleep quality overall?

Exercise Scale
How often have you engaged in any physical activity (such as walking, jogging, biking, going to the gym, playing tennis, hockey, or soccer)
How would you rate your exercise quality overall?

Nutrition Scale
How often have you eaten healthy food (such as fruits, vegetables, whole grains)?
How would you rate your nutrition quality overall?

Task-Related Resources Scale
Professional skills
Interpersonal skills
Planning skills
Coping skills
Professional knowledge
Common knowledge

Social–Emotional Resources Scale
Values
Positive self-evaluations (i.e., self-esteem)
Positive emotions
Other emotional resources (i.e., optimism)
Influence from social connections
Information from social connections
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