

Florida Institute of Technology

Scholarship Repository @ Florida Tech

Theses and Dissertations

5-2021

The Moderating Effect of Proactivity in Role Accumulation and Work-Family Enrichment

Sarah Jensen

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.fit.edu/etd>



Part of the Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons

The Moderating Effect of Proactivity in
Role Accumulation and Work-Family Enrichment

by

Sarah Jensen

A thesis submitted to the School of Psychology of
Florida Institute of Technology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Science
in
Industrial/Organizational Psychology

Melbourne, Florida
May, 2021

We the undersigned committee hereby approve the attached thesis,
“The Moderating Effect of Proactivity in Role Accumulation and Work-Family
Enrichment”

by
Sarah Jensen

Gary Burns, Ph.D.
Professor
School of Psychology
Major Advisor

Patrick Converse, Ph.D.
Professor
School of Psychology

Catherine Nicholson, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School of Behavioral Analysis
Committee Member

Robert Taylor, Ph.D.
Professor and Interim Dean
College of Psychology and Liberal Arts

Abstract

Title: The Moderating Effect of Proactivity in Role Accumulation and Work-Family Enrichment

Author: Sarah Jensen

Advisor: Gary Burns

Research exploring the dynamics between work and family has primarily focused on the conflict that can arise between them, and there continues to be a gap in the more positive aspects of this dynamic. Work-family enrichment helps to view these roles as allies, and focus' on how people can use resources found in one role to benefit another; with a greater number of roles leading to a greater opportunity for resources. The implication of these and similar findings give employees and organizations a necessary perspective towards improving well-being and performance. Trait affectivity, and more specifically, proactive behavior, has been cited as a possible mechanism to further understand the relationship between work and family. The goal of this study is to a) understand role accumulation from a resource gain development and role accumulation theory and how that can lead to role enrichment, and b) how proactive behavior and proactive coping can moderate the relationship between role accumulation and role enrichment.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review	4
Work-Family Enrichment	4
Role Accumulation	8
Role Strain	12
Proactive Behavior	14
Proactive Coping	17
Chapter 3 Methods	20
Participants	20
Measures	20
Analysis	23
Chapter 4 Results	24
Chapter 5 Discussion	27
Chapter 6 References	31
Appendix	37

Chapter 1

Introduction

As the climate of work continues to change and evolve, so too does the relationship it shares with family. The dynamic between work and family has been extensively studied, but this is often done from a conflict perspective, where they are enemies rather than allies (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). In recent years, literature looking at the dynamic between work and family has moved past its focus on conflict, to more positive effects such as enrichment, facilitation, role enhancement, and spillover (Weer, Greenhaus, & Linnehan, 2010). Work-family enrichment has emerged as an alternative focus, in part, to embrace the reality of the society we live in, where most are involved in multiple roles either by choice or necessity. It is a necessary counterpart as it focuses more on the dynamic between these roles, how they are afforded with more opportunity for resources and well-being, and deserves an increased focus in emerging research to fully understand this construct and its impact on individuals, systems, and organizations. Work-family enrichment is an important construct to understand, as its research can help us make an impact on improving the well-being and lives of employees (Kossek, Baltes, & Matthews, 2011). If organizations can help employees cultivate resources within their existing roles, it can save time, effort, and money in the long run, improving the well-being and satisfaction of the employee and the sustainability of the organization.

As work and family represent two significant roles in many people's lives, it is understandable that the construct of role accumulation would be a part of this literature. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) discuss several ways that role accumulation can lead to

positive impacts for people in the context of work and family, such as; work and family experiences having additive beneficial effects on well-being, participation in one role buffering the distress of another role and vice versa, and last, that there can be a transfer of positive experiences in one role to another. When people can understand the benefits that these resources can have on other roles they are involved in, it allows them to take more control over their situation.

For this thesis, role accumulation will be expanded to include roles outside of the family and work dynamics. Another important distinction for this study is that role accumulation will be defined by roles that are accumulated voluntarily and from a self-serving motivation, such as someone deciding to volunteer, participate in intramural sports, or get married. This helps to differentiate research that looks at role accumulation from a perspective of necessity, such as people that add a second job due to financial need. This also speaks to the current state of our society, where it is increasingly uncommon for people to be involved in less than three roles (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Given that many are involved in multiple roles, accumulated and rich with available resources, they may struggle with how best to identify and utilize these to improve and enrich the dynamics between their work and family life. For some, this process comes naturally and affords them the ability to benefit from these resources between roles. For others, the ability to anticipate, identify, and initiate behavior to take advantage of resources is a process that needs to be cultivated and practiced.

Personality traits and proactivity have been discussed in the literature as one mechanism people can utilize to change and plan within their environment (Bateman, & Crant, 1993; Seibert, Crant, & Kraimer, 1993). Proactive behavior mimics the discussion

earlier on viewing the work-family dynamic from an enrichment versus conflict perspective. When people can utilize proactive behavior, they may be more likely to identify resources within their roles that can lead to increased enrichment, versus people who are more reactive to their environments and maintain the status quo. In addition, they may have a more future-focused view on their roles, and be more adept at leveraging and utilizing their resources most effectively. This, in turn, has been shown to improve job performance, life and career satisfaction, and career success.

Although literature exists establishing a relationship between role accumulation and work-family enrichment, the impact of various personality traits and behavior on this relationship has not been explored thoroughly. More specifically, the role of proactive behavior has yet to be explored between these domains. Also, although studies have looked at personality traits as having a moderating effect on work-family dynamics, this literature has gaps and there have not been studies looking at personality behaviors as a moderator on this relationship. By researching the impact of proactive behavior on the relationship between role accumulation and work-family enrichment, it allows us to understand how directed intentionality can improve a person's situation and give people an empowering lens with which to view their life.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Work-family enrichment

Work-family enrichment has been defined by Greenhaus and Powell (2006) as an individual's involvement in one domain influencing their quality of life and performance in another domain. The focus on this specific construct is on the increase, or enrichment, of what the individual gains from involvement in both work and family. Enrichment focuses on the individual as the unit of analysis, in addition to differing pathways that allow the transfer of resources between the two domains. When reviewing existing literature on work-family enrichment, it is helpful to also review constructs such as facilitation, positive spillover, and resource enrichment. Although similar, work-family facilitation has been operationalized as "the extent to which an individual's engagement in one life domain provides gains which contribute to enhanced functioning of another life domain" (Wayne, Grzywacz, Carleson, & Kacmar, 2007, pg 63). Spillover is unique amongst these constructs as it can include both a positive or a negative transfer of resources and focuses on how individuals can utilize another role to obtain or fulfill what is lacking in the first (Hanson, Hammer, & Colton, 2006). Hanson et al. (2006) describe spillover as a correlation between work and family domains, as the transfer of resources increase the similarity between the two. Although similar, these constructs differ in both the way the transfer of resources is conceptualized, but also the focus on what is being measured. Facilitation is distinct from enrichment and spillover as the focus is on what is being measured, which is changes in system-level functioning. As literature surrounding

work-family enrichment includes many similar terms, it is important to identify the specific construct being utilized.

In addition to some confusion in the literature regarding construct differentiation, there has also been discussion surrounding the use of theoretical backing not originally intended for these constructs (Goplalan, Grzywacz, & Cui, 2018). Many which are currently used in the work-family literature attempt to explain one specific aspect of this relationship, but often fail to provide a unified concept of what exactly is occurring at the intersection of these two domains. In addition, most construct definitions and theoretical backings focus on work-family enrichment as occurring solely from an individual perspective, without acknowledging the system level transfer of resources or gain. When considering the domain of family in regards to work and enrichment, it can be helpful to view that domain as a system functioning together, with various aspects and intricacies possibly affecting the work domain. As with any newer area of study, it takes time to identify and develop appropriate theoretical backing and construct definitions. Goplalan et al. (2018) discuss resource gain development theory as a sound option for exploring the dynamics of work-family enrichment and propose that it provides an all-encompassing explanation of the interaction that takes place between these domains, and how that can result in enrichment. They discuss that individuals fundamentally look to maximize positive experiences, and when they gain resources in one domain it provides opportunities to engage in their environment in a more complex and enriching manner.

One of the defining characteristics of work-family enrichment was discussed by Hanson et al. (2006). They made an important distinction between two types of work-family enrichment. The first, instrumental, describes how skills, values, and abilities can

be applied to another role. The second type, affective, describes how emotions or affect can be transferred from one role to another. This transfer has been showcased by studies in the form of traits such as self-confidence and self-conceptualization (Stephens, Franks, & Atienza 1997). Although there have been studies that show work-family enrichment and work-family conflict as two opposite ends of the same continuum (Tompson, & Werner, 1997), correlational analysis shows that they are unique constructs (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

To further understand work and family roles, research has at times differentiated the two into conceptually different types depending on the precipitation of the enrichment (Frone, 2003; Greenhouse & Foley, 2007; Weer, Greenhaus, & Linnehan, 2010). This bidirectionality addresses the reciprocal nature of this dynamic relationship, as work can enrich family, and family can enrich work (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). On the other end of this spectrum, work-family conflict can include antecedents such as family support and flexible work schedules and include outcomes such as increased life and job satisfaction and job performance (Grzywacz, & Marks, 2000). Sui et al. (2010) discuss how engagement with work is an especially important antecedent to work enrichment, as it can increase the amount of positive resources individuals gain from their work domain.

Outcomes of work-family enrichment such as job satisfaction and effort have shown to surpass the negative effects of work-family conflict; however, before focusing on positive outcomes of enrichment, it is necessary to explore the antecedents (Wayne, Randall, & Stevens, 2006). Factors such as individual differences, organizational support, and family support have all been shown to be antecedents of work-family enrichment. Wayne et al. (2006) found that the more important a role was to an individual's sense of

self, the greater amount of enrichment they experienced. Bhargava and Baral (2009) also described core self-evaluations and job characteristics as additional antecedents to enrichment. One aspect discussed by Lapierre, Yanhong, Ho Kwong, Greenhaus, and DiRenzo (2018) is that the role the antecedents play in an individual's level of enrichment depends on the amount of psychological involvement in each domain and those antecedents can lead to differing levels of enrichment based on this. Understandably, antecedents relating to either direction, work-to-family and family-to-work tend to have stronger relationships, several antecedents have also been shown to have significant relationships with either direction.

Enrichment is often discussed in the literature from a work and family perspective, but Daniel and Sonnentag (2014) point out that this can also be viewed between work and other life domains. Individuals who are not married, have children, or live by themselves can also experience enrichment in their personal lives, which underscores the importance of looking at how enrichment can be impacted by multiple roles within an individual's life. For example, an individual who lives alone, with no partner or children may experience success at work that they then go celebrate with friends afterward. Enrichment is then transferred from this individual's work domain to their personal domain, even though they do not fit into a traditional domain of family. This also addresses the need to subscribe to a more diverse definition of both family and non-family roles and incorporate people who do not fall into more traditional models. Additionally, a broader view encompasses a greater variety of societal and demographic backgrounds, which not only reduces unfairness for people who do not fall into traditional definitions of these roles but also increases the ability for results to be applied

and generalized to the greater population. Viewing enrichment from a perspective of how multiple roles within an individual's life contribute to each other leads to a more holistic understanding of this phenomenon and increases the likelihood of utilizing and increasing the ability for individuals to access and utilize these resources.

The positive effects of enrichment aren't often an organizational focus, but should be as they include increased effort during work roles, higher levels of organizational citizenship behaviors, and decreased turnover intention (Bhargava & Baral, 2009; Wayne et al., 2006). However, Goplalan, Grzywacz, and Cui (2018) do mention how organizations have noticed the increasing proportion of the labor force who are seeking work that is a "good fit" with their personal and/or family life and that positioning themselves as "family-friendly" often means having a competitive advantage against other organizations. When individuals engage in roles they view as "high quality" it increases the likelihood of resulting positive outcomes in other domains they are engaged in such as family. As work-family enrichment is the result of the use of resources from one domain in another, it is reasonable to conclude the addition or accumulation of more domains or roles would lead to an increase in a person's ability to experience enrichment.

Role Accumulation

Role accumulation is generally defined as the engagement in more than one role, often referring to work, family, parenting, etc. (Sieber, 1974). Sieber (1974) was one of the first to discuss role accumulation theory and suggested that the multiplicity of roles can present individuals with benefits past potential stress connected with remaining active within these roles. Mark's (1977) took this a step further by studying what the positive outcomes were when people chose to participate in multiple roles. The

percentage of employees engaged in multiple roles has increased in recent times due to a variety of factors. Notably, this increase is specifically referring to discretionary role accumulation, where people are choosing to add another role to their life. Arguably, the motivation behind doing so in discretionary cases would likely be that the individual hopes it will add value or increase well-being. This is an important distinction from non-discretionary accrual, as someone adding a second job to increase financial security despite feeling stressed with their current workload, or feeling compelled or forced into an additional role by external factors is more likely to predispose the relationship between other roles and domains as conflict rather than enrichment. Single parents, dual-earner partners, care for aging parents and multiple job holding are becoming increasingly frequent, and forces us to look closer at the motivation behind this push towards role accumulation.

Outcomes of role accumulation have also been widely cited and include; increased life satisfaction, job performance, and elevated self-esteem (Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer, & King, 2002). For example, an individual who decides to take a weekend class on a visual graphics software may be able to increase the quality of the presentations they give at work, in turn increasing both their job performance and their self-esteem. Notably, such as in this example, positive resources gained in one role can increase and impact enrichment in several roles within an individual's life. Weer, Greenhaus, and Linnehan (2010) also found there was a positive effect on job performance from resources employees gained from roles they were engaged in outside of work.

Previous research has indicated a relationship between role accumulation and role enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Voydanoff, 2001), with a couple theories

providing insight into the nature of this relationship. Resource gain development is one theory that helps to explain how people are able to accumulate resources throughout experiences and interactions (Hobfoll, 1989; Siu, Baker, Brough, Wang, Kalliath, & Timms, 2015). The accumulation of resources is an important point regarding this theory, as it implies that an individual can store resources to use for future use, creating an almost buffering effect against future and potential stressors that may occur within other roles. Sieber (1974) also discussed how the multiplicity of roles can present individuals with benefits past potential stress connected with remaining active within these roles. He is also often cited as one of the pioneers of role accumulation theory, which explains some of the motivation behind why individuals would participate in multiple roles, and supports the idea that resources created during this focused energy can contribute to enrichment. These explanations provide a foundation for understanding the nature of the relationship between role accumulation and role enrichment.

Research exploring the interaction between these two constructs acknowledges a relationship and attempts to explain how this comes about. This relationship has been commonly discussed as coming from one of three paths. The first, is where work experiences in combination with family experiences have additional effects on a person's well-being (Barnett, & Hyde, 2001). These effects can extend beyond well-being to include life satisfaction, happiness and the overall perception of quality of life. This can be further explained by the type and quality of the role, in the sense that they can fall on a spectrum, with some adding more benefit than others. The idea behind this is that when work *and* family roles both result in increased satisfaction, a person will experience

greater well-being than someone who is only involved in one of those roles or is not satisfied within a role.

The second path discussed in role accumulation and work-family literature is how a person's involvement in work and family roles can aid in protecting them from distress in one of the roles (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). This has been supported by research showing that individuals with higher-quality work or family experiences have weaker relationships between impaired well-being and stress in either of these roles. Barnett and colleagues have found that social roles can have a moderating effect on distress and individual experiences in a certain role can weaken the impact it would have otherwise had (Barnett, Marshall & Sayer, 1992; Barnett, Marshall, & Pleck, 1992). Regardless, literature supports the idea that involvement in more than one role can act as a protective factor to buffer negative experiences from other roles.

Lastly, and distinct from the previous two paths, is a relationship which results in a transfer of positive experiences in one role to another (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). This occurs when an individual has a positive experience at work, for example, which produces a positive experience within their family role. This path can be further explained by conservation of resource theory which explains how resources gained in one area can spill over into other roles (Barnett, Marshall & Sayer, 1992; Hobfoll, 1989). In addition, it explains how people can conserve positive experiences in one role to use in another, or how these resources can have lasting effects. It is this last path that most clearly captures the character of role enrichment and leads to the first hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1: There will be a positive relationship between discretionary role accumulation and work-family enrichment.

Role Strain

An important factor when discussing role accumulation is the consideration of role strain. If resources gained in one role can be transferred and contribute to enrichment in another role, the natural question arises of how many roles can be accumulated before these positive effects are overcome by negative effects. Role strain is also referred to in the literature as role overload or role stress, and is generally defined as "...the perception that the demands imposed by a single or multiple roles are so great that time and energy resources are not sufficient to fulfill the requirements of the roles to the satisfaction of one's self or others" (Duxbury & Higgins, p. 250, 2017). In addition to this, Khan et al. (1964) discussed how role strain does not necessarily imply that strain is felt across all roles, but can be experienced only in a singular role and depends on whether the individual is experiencing pressure from perceived or actual demands from others or internally. Ashforth et al. (2000) discussed how the transition between different roles can come at a cost to the individual, as they have an identity within each role that could be disrupted when changing to a new role.

This discussion is furthered by Matthew, Winkel, and Wayne (2014), who talk about interdomain transitions, where individuals switch repeatedly back and forth between various roles and what impact that can have. They found that the more roles an individual participated in, the more individuals found the boundaries between these roles were blurred and difficult to differentiate from each other. Once time and attention are given in another role, it can be difficult for people to switch their attention back to the role they are in. For example, if a person is at work and calls to check on their children before returning to work, there will likely be a lag in productivity that occurs during this

transition back into their work role. Understandably, the more roles a person has accumulated increases the potential for these interrole transitions, and a reciprocal increase in the potential for role strain that can occur. In addition, there is a process and maintenance involved in roles where individuals are attempting to adhere to certain expectations and behaviors. When a role is interrupted by another role, it can cause a disruption in this identity and result in strain.

Conservation of resources theory can also be used to help explain the underlying mechanisms of these situations, as transitioning between roles means an individual doesn't have access to as many resources in the new role (Hobfoll, 1989). Even if some resources are transferred or spill over to the new role as is the focus in this study, there are certain resources that are more difficult or unable to transfer. These examples help to illustrate how despite the benefits various roles can provide to work or family domains, there may be a ceiling or limit to these benefits, where the strain produced from interdomain transitions and resource depletion begin to overtake the positive effects and outcomes of enrichment on these domains. However, it is important to note that just because an individual may be shifting resources across various roles while engaged in a specific role, it does not inherently mean they will perceive this as interfering with the role they are in. If a person chooses to answer work emails at home in the evening, for example, they may view this as staying caught up at work and feel accomplished rather than see this as an intrusion. This underscores how important individual differences and dispositions are in these types of domain relationships, as there is no general rule for how many roles will result in enrichment for one person, but possibly result in strain or conflict for another person who views an excess of roles as a drain on resources.

Acknowledging there are both positive and negative consequences of role transitions allows us to look more closely at how the quantity of those roles plays into whether the potential benefits of enrichment are overcome by strain at a certain point in accumulation.

Hypothesis 2: Role accumulation will have a curvilinear relationship with work-family enrichment such that after a certain point it will no longer be positively correlated with work-family enrichment.

Proactive Behavior

There is also promising support for the idea that trait affectivity can play a moderating role in the relationship between role accumulation and role enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Trait affectivity not only impacts mood and satisfaction, but also how well an individual is able to respond to stress or conflict (Schaubroeck, Ganster, & Kemmerer, 1996; Shaw, Duffy, Jenkins, & Gupta, 1999; Stoeva, Chiu, & Greenhaus, 2002). Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson, and Kacmar (2007) also discuss conservation of resource theory (COR) as a means to explain how people can use their inherent resources to facilitate enrichment and help enable that transfer to other domains. As trait affectivity includes a large body of research, this study focus' specifically on proactivity, and the role it plays within a person's chosen roles and resulting well-being. Although there is existing literature exploring specific personality traits and their role in both role accumulation and role enrichment, research focusing on state-like characteristics and behavior still needs to be developed. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) also discuss the need for future research that explores an individual's dispositional characteristics at various points in the work-family enrichment relationship and cite proactive personality as a trait which may be especially suited in promoting role

enrichment. Those who are proactive are more adept at developing skills, accepting social supports, remain flexible in their time commitments, and most importantly, are able to take advantage of the resources generated in one role and apply them to another. Seibert, Crant, and Kraimer (1999) discuss how individuals who are proactive approach work differently than those who are less proactive. People with this trait tend to select and curate situations that often enhance performance.

Proactive personality is presented in the literature from both a trait and behavior perspective. Much of these studies focus on how proactive personality is a stable trait which can lead to proactive behavior, and in turn, positive outcomes (Bates, Crant & Kraimer, 1993). These outcomes can include; finding and solving organizational problems, identifying and acting on opportunities, and initiative to make change. By focusing on proactivity from more of a behavioral standpoint, it allows for research that is more generalizable to a greater population of both people and organizations, and provides an understanding of how this behavior could be beneficial in promoting enrichment in their work and family roles. Most studies on work-family enrichment involve self-report measures which often don't indicate the specific role experiences people have that may lead to enrichment in other roles (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). This leaves us without a clear understanding of the transfer of resources that can lead to enrichment between roles.

In addition to evidence of the relationship between role accumulation and role enrichment, there are also theories that support the idea of behavioral states leading to changes in role enrichment. As mentioned in the previous discussion on role enrichment, this study focus' on the aspect of this relationship that involves the transfer of resources

from one role to another. How these resources originate or are generated is an important part of this process and helps us to understand how this can be replicated or promoted to facilitate well-being (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Grzywacz, 2002). Literature discussing proactive personality traits and behavioral outcomes often explain this from an interactional psychology perspective (Bates, Crant & Kraimer, 1993). Interactional theories help us to understand how traits and behaviors interact with our environment, but they can also help us understand how these behaviors can be cultivated when there isn't an underlying trait or disposition directly causing them. This would allow for a person to react or interact to their environment by developing behaviors, such as proactivity, that would allow them to facilitate increased enrichment in their roles. This explains how behavior can be influenced both from internal and external forces from a person and their environment, including their ability to select and change situations. Understandably, this is a complex process as there are many forces that act on individuals and shape their behavior. What is missing from the literature are studies that speak to a person's ability to cultivate proactivity as a new behavior, where they may not inherently possess it as a dispositional trait. There are several studies that cite the likelihood of personal characteristics and behavior generating resources, but this literature is insufficient.

As previously discussed, more resources are able to be generated in the accumulation of roles, which affords more opportunities for an individual to use these resources. An individual who possesses a proactive personality may be better suited to utilizing these resources than others and therefore enhances this relationship (Searle & Lee, 2015). However, individuals who may not inherently possess traits of proactivity

have been found to still be able to utilize and cultivate proactive behaviors including proactive coping mechanisms.

Hypothesis 3a: Proactive personality will moderate the relationship between role accumulation and work-family enrichment.

Proactive Coping

Coping strategies have long been established as having the ability to potentially moderate the stress-strain relationship (DeRijk, Blanc, Schaufeli, & De Jonge, 1998). Much of this research focuses on their ability to react to stress, and not as much focus has been targeted at their ability to manage future stressors (Aspinwall & Taylor, 1997). What makes them particularly useful is their ability to be accessed when there is a specific need, but then stored, so to speak, when the need passes. Understandably, these coping strategies are viewed as a personal resource for individuals, and have shown promising support for their moderating role on stress and potential impact on well-being.

Proactive coping has been defined as “efforts undertaken in advance of a potentially stressful event to prevent it or modify its form before it occurs” and can be distinguished from other coping strategies as the ability to prepare for future stressors rather than simply reacting to current stressors (Searle & Lee, 2015, p. 47). Whereas proactive behavior involves more of an anticipation of future events and stressors and may involve setting goals to mitigate or avoid the impact of these stressors, proactive coping focuses on a more action-oriented approach. However, as with other constructs discussed, difficulty lies in the ability to accurately operationalize proactive coping. Fuller and Marler (2009) discuss its distinction from proactive behavior, but also that it remains a predictor of proactive behavior which aligns it more towards personality than

behavior. What remains a question in much of the research, then, is what situations or stressors motivate individuals to engage in proactive coping to meet demands within roles and whether they must inherently have this ability prior to a stressor or strain occurring, or whether it is something that can be cultivated in the face of a stressor within a role.

Similar to proactive behavior, proactive coping has the ability to have a positive impact on well-being and enrichment. Both involve anticipating future events and potential problems, and taking steps to either mitigate or modify their effects beforehand. An important distinction when discussing coping strategies, is that their effectiveness is largely based on how closely they match the stress or demand they are faced with. For this reason, proactive coping may be more suited towards aiding in mitigating conflict or strain between some roles or demands over others. For example, an individual may be able to utilize proactive coping effectively with the demand of time between roles by using time management to plan ahead and use their time effectively, but this form of coping may not be as useful for last minute changes or unforeseeable events that take place within roles and therefore impact other roles. Regardless, proactivity appears to be a key piece in an individual's ability to surpass challenges and stressors encountered within roles in a more effective manner than those with less proactive coping. Its value also lies in its ability to be increased and learned as a coping strategy for individuals not accustomed to planning and strategizing methods for responding to stressors before they occur. This understandably has important impacts for the individual, their family systems and organizations they work in, as it would allow people to transform their potential experience of responding to stressors and strain from a reactive to a proactive approach.

Hypothesis 3b: Proactive coping will moderate the relationship between role accumulation and work-family enrichment.

Chapter 3

Methods

Participants

A total of 249 participant over the age of 18 were recruited from Amazon's mTurk. Participants were eligible to participate if they were working part or full time and if they reported being in a relationship or having children. There were 114 males, 133 females, and 2 people who identified as non-binary included. Ethnicity of participants was 76% Caucasian, 8% Black, 5% Hispanic/Latino, 6% Asian, 1% Native American and 2% Other, with a mean age of 37 years old. All participants completed survey measures online via Qualtrics.

Measures

Role Accumulation. The measure of role accumulation chosen for this study was an adaptation from Weer, Greenhaus, & Linnehan (2010). Participants were asked whether they participate in roles from 6 domains; work, family, community, leisure, student, and religion. Examples were given for each category to help clarify where participants should classify their roles, such as leisure will have book club, intramural sports and Audubon society listed after it. Within these domains they were asked how many roles they participate within each one and were allowed to select up to 20 roles for each category depending on what applied to them. Role accumulation was operationalized both as the number of different domains or categories participants had roles in and as the total number of roles that they identified across domains.

Role Specific Questions. I also collected data on participants' engagement in each of these roles. Consistent with Hanson et al. (2006), Sui et al. (2010), and Weer et al.

(2010), questions about engagement, instrumental support across roles, affective components of the role, and interference were collected. These variables fall outside of the current proposed hypothesis and were collected for future data analysis.

Work-Family Enrichment. The measure of work-family enrichment chosen for this study was the original 18 item scale by Carlson, D., Kacmar, K. M., Zivnuska, S., Ferguson, M., and Whitten, D. (2006). Although there are shorter measures available which have been adapted from this original scale such as that by Kacmar, Crawford, Carlson, Ferguson, and Whitten, (2014), it was determined that using the full 18 item scale would be beneficial in measuring work-family enrichment.

This scale utilizes a 5-point Likert scale with anchors from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). It includes 9 items representing the work to family enrichment direction, and 9 items from the family to work direction. Examples of the work to family enrichment direction items include; “My involvement in my work helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me be a better family member,” and “My involvement in my work provides me with a sense of accomplishment and this helps me be a better family member.” Examples of the family to work direction items include; “My involvement in my family helps me expand my knowledge of new things and this helps me be a better worker,” and “My involvement in my family helps encourages me to use my work time in a focused manner and this helps me be a better worker.” Items were adapted to focus on “other roles to family” enrichment and “other roles to work” enrichment, to expand beyond two roles. Revised items are presented in the Appendix. A reliability analysis showed this measure reached an acceptable level, $\alpha = .94$.

Work-Family Conflict. Although this paper is focused on work-family enrichment, I also included items adapted from Netemeyer, Boles, and McMurrian's (1996) work-family and family-work conflict scale. An example item is, "The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life". The 10-items will be measured on a 5-point Likert scale with anchors from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Similar to work-family enrichment, items were adapted to focus on other-role conflict. Revised items are presented in the Appendix. A reliability analysis showed this measure reached an acceptable level, $\alpha = .95$. These variables fall outside of the current proposed hypothesis and were collected for future data analysis.

Proactive Behavior. The measure of proactive behavior chosen for this study was The Proactive Personality Scale developed by Bateman and Crant (1993). It comprises 17 items utilizing a 5-point Likert scale with anchors from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Examples of items range from, "I am constantly on the lookout for new ways to improve my life," and "I am great at turning problems into opportunities." A reliability analysis showed this measure reached an acceptable level, $\alpha = .91$.

Proactive Coping. The measure of proactive coping chosen for this study is the Proactive Coping Scale (Greenglass, Schwartz, & Taubert, 1999). It comprises 14 items utilizing a 5-point Likert scale with anchors from 1 (not at all true) to 5 (completely true). Examples of items include; "I like challenges and beating the odds" and "I always try to find a way to work around obstacles; nothing really stops me." A reliability analysis showed this measure reached an acceptable level, $\alpha = .86$.

Analyses

The proposed linear and curvilinear relationships between role accumulation and role enrichment were tested with hierarchical multiple regression. A total of four analyses were conducted, examining both operationalizations of role accumulation (number of domains as “total roles” and number of roles across domains as “role categories”), and the two dependent variables (role-work enrichment and role-family enrichment). In these analyses, role enrichment was first regressed on role accumulation, providing a test of hypothesis 1, and then the squared role accumulation variable was added, providing a test of hypothesis 2.

Hypotheses 3a and 3b were also tested with hierarchical multiple regression. A total of eight analyses were conducted, examining the moderation of the relationships described above by either proactive personality or proactive coping. Moderation analyses for the two variables were conducted separately to gain a cleaner picture of their moderating role. Analyses built off the previously reported hierarchical regression models by adding the moderator, then adding the moderator and role accumulation interaction term, and finally adding the moderator and squared role accumulation interaction term.

Chapter 4

Results

Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be a positive relationship between role accumulation and role enrichment. This hypothesis was tested by examining the correlations between these variables. Hypothesis 1 was partially supported for both number of categories and number of roles. Number of categories was related to role family enrichment ($r = .127, p < .05$) but not role work enrichment ($r = .067, p > .05$). The number of roles was related to role work enrichment ($r = .132, p < .05$) but not role family enrichment ($r = .114, p > .05$). Correlations between all study variables can be found in Table 1.

Hypothesis 2 stated there would be a curvilinear relationship between role accumulation and role enrichment such that after a certain point it will no longer be positively correlated with role enrichment. Hypothesis 2 was not supported. There was no evidence of a curvilinear relationship between number of categories or number of roles and the enrichment variables. More specifically, for role family enrichment, the quadratic component did not explain incremental variance for either the number of categories, $\Delta R^2 = .002, \Delta F = .574, p > .05$, or the number of roles, $\Delta R^2 = .002, \Delta F = .412, p > .05$. For role work enrichment, the same pattern was observed, with the quadratic component being not significant for either the number of categories, $\Delta R^2 = .008, \Delta F = 2.110, p > .05$, or the number of roles, $\Delta R^2 = .000, \Delta F = .036, p > .05$. The quadratic regression results can be found in Tables 2-5.

Hypothesis 3a and 3b proposed that proactive behavior and proactive coping would moderate the relationship between role accumulation and role enrichment.

Because I examined both the linear and non-linear relationships in Hypotheses 1 and 2, I tested for moderation of both of these components. This required four regressions for Hypothesis 3a and four for Hypothesis 3b. The first two regressions examined the moderating effect of proactive behavior on the relationships between the number of role categories with role family enrichment and role work enrichment. The second two examined the moderating effect of proactive behavior on the relationship between number of roles and these two enrichment variables. These analyses were repeated for proactive coping. Overall, there was no support for Hypotheses 3a and 3b.

Focusing first on role family enrichment, the interaction between proactive behavior and the total number of roles did not explain incremental variance beyond the main effects, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F = .042$, $p > .05$. Similarly, the interaction between proactive behavior and the squared total number of roles did not explain incremental variance beyond the main effects, the linear action, and the curvilinear effects of number of roles, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $\Delta F = 2.05$, $p > .05$. Similar results were observed when using number of role categories, with neither the linear interaction, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F = .041$, $p > .05$, nor the quadratic interaction, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F = 0.91$, $p > .05$, significant. Results are presented in Table 2.

For role work enrichment, the interaction between proactive behavior and the total number of roles did not explain incremental variance beyond the main effects, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F = .072$, $p > .05$. Similarly, the interaction between proactive behavior and the squared total number of roles did not explain incremental variance beyond the main effects, the linear action, and the curvilinear effects of number of roles, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F = .031$, $p > .05$. Similar results were observed when using number of role categories, with neither the

linear interaction, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F = .31$, $p > .05$, nor the quadratic interaction, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F = 1.27$, $p > .05$, significant. Results are presented in Table 3.

Switching to proactive coping and focusing on role family enrichment, the interaction between proactive behavior and the total number of roles did not explain incremental variance beyond the main effects, $\Delta R^2 = .021$, $\Delta F = 6.45$, $p > .05$. Similarly, the interaction between proactive behavior and the squared total number of roles did not explain incremental variance beyond the main effects, the linear action, and the curvilinear effects of number of roles, $\Delta R^2 = .001$, $\Delta F = .285$, $p > .05$. Similar results were observed when using number of role categories, with neither the linear interaction, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F = .60$, $p > .05$, nor the quadratic interaction, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F = 1.64$, $p > .05$, significant. Results are presented in Table 4.

For proactive coping and role work enrichment, the interaction between proactive behavior and the total number of roles did not explain incremental variance beyond the main effects, $\Delta R^2 = .018$, $\Delta F = 5.36$, $p > .05$. Similarly, the interaction between proactive behavior and the squared total number of roles did not explain incremental variance beyond the main effects, the linear action, and the curvilinear effects of number of roles, $\Delta R^2 = .004$, $\Delta F = 1.09$, $p > .05$. Similar results were observed when using number of role categories, with neither the linear interaction, $\Delta R^2 = .004$, $\Delta F = 1.39$, $p > .05$, nor the quadratic interaction, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F = .149$, $p > .05$, significant. Results are presented in Table 5.

Chapter 5

Discussion

The only hypothesis with partial support was Hypothesis 1, which found the more categories of roles people have the more enrichment they have with family roles and the more roles they have altogether, the more enrichment they have with work roles. The hypothesized curvilinear relationships I proposed were not supported. This means the relationship between role accumulation and enrichment is linear and adding more roles or responsibilities is not necessarily detrimental to enrichment. It should be noted that these effects were small.

Proactive behavior and proactive coping did have a positive effect on role enrichment. However, proactivity did not moderate the relationship between role accumulation and role enrichment. This demonstrates that focusing on proactive behaviors is beneficial regardless of the number of other activities or roles you are engaged in. These results provide some support for how people can use their existing roles to gain resources and promote enrichment rather than conflict.

These results are consistent with the study by Weer, Greenhaus and Linnehan (2010) that found there was a positive effect on job performance from resources employees gained from roles they were engaged in outside of work. Adding to that literature, my study differentiates roles between total roles and different role categories and found that one was more beneficial towards family enrichment (role categories), and the other was more beneficial towards work enrichment (total roles). This is an interesting distinction to more fully understand the underlying mechanics of how and why enrichment is brought about by variations in roles. As outcomes of role

accumulation can include increased life satisfaction, job performance and elevated self-esteem, research that allows us to understand its dynamics further is useful (Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer, & King, 2002).

Additionally, this study looked at whether proactivity moderated this relationship, and although this was not found to be true, it did show an effect on enrichment.

Greenhaus and Powell (2006) have discussed the need for future research on how a person's disposition can impact the work-family relationship, and what aspects might promote enrichment over conflict. This is especially interesting, as it may allow people to further understand ways they can use both traits and behavior to enhance enrichment and reduce stress between their work and family domains. Seibert, Crant, and Kraimer (1999) have also specifically mentioned proactivity and its impact on work, as people who are more proactive approach work differently than people who are less proactive. Although small, my results help understand the role proactivity plays in the work-family relationship.

Limitations

As with many studies, a main limitation of this study was the use of surveys as a method of collecting data, as they often have a hard time capturing a participant's full experience. The work-family relationship and the purpose and means by which people accumulate roles is nuanced and complex, and likely not able to be fully understood by using only quantitative measures. Data was collected primarily using mturk, and although it is able to survey a large number of participants from various backgrounds, not having participants from a certain industry could have potentially impacted the data.

Additionally, as this design was cross-sectional we are not able to attribute causality

between the variables and can only rely on their level of correlation. Another limitation of this study was some potential misunderstanding regarding the instructions on the survey. For role accumulation, the instructions asked participants to state how many total roles they were engaged in, followed by a question asking how many of those roles were discretionary. Several participants answered that they had a certain number of total roles (three, four, etc), but then stated that they had more than ten discretionary roles.

One potentially significant limitation to this study was that the data was collected during the 2020 COVID pandemic. Understandably, the impact of this on the results is unknown, but as many people's lives and roles have been altered the relationships between the variables in this study could have also been affected. Many people who worked in an office are now working from home, children who would normally be in school are home with parents and many extracurricular activities have been put on hold. As this study aimed to focus on the enriching side of the work-family relationship, this time point in our history may have tainted those dynamics for the present moment.

Future Research

Although these results are helpful for furthering our understanding of the work-family and role accumulation literature and the interplay of dispositional traits in these relationships, there is still a lack of clarity in how different variables affect these dynamics. As mentioned previously these results were collected amidst a pandemic where many people's roles and work dynamics were affected. It would be interesting to collect data after the end of the pandemic in order to compare the results and how these relationships were possibly affected. Along those lines, having more data points included in a longitudinal study would also allow for more evidence of how an increase in role

accumulation changes its relationship with enrichment. Including more time points may begin to show the curvilinear relationship we were hoping to see with this study.

As the majority of work-family and role accumulation literature is conceptualized from data collected from surveys, it would be interesting to conduct future studies with qualitative data to provide a richer understanding of these relationships that may not be captured with pre-determined questionnaires. Additionally, understanding what people's perception of their roles, either positive or negative, would provide a more holistic view of how and why they influence work-family relationships as they do.

Conclusion

My results, taken with the previous literature, suggest small but positive effects of role accumulation in addition to proactivity's impact on enrichment. Proactivity can be an important tool for both individuals and organizations as it provides understanding and a path towards greater satisfaction and performance. Organizations may be able to utilize employees with proactive personalities in more dynamic or evolving positions, which might lead towards higher job performance or increased problem-solving. Employees who can develop or access proactive tendencies or behaviors might also be more likely to have increased life and job satisfaction, as my results show that proactivity was the strongest predictor of role enrichment. The benefits of this study are dynamic and empowering and leave both individuals and organizations with a means to impact and change the world around them.

Chapter 6

References

- Aspinwall, L. G., & Taylor, S. E. (1997). A stitch in time: Self-regulation and proactive coping. *Psychological Bulletin*, *121*, 417–436.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*(6), 1173–1182.
- Barnett, R.C., & Baruch, G.K. 1985. Women’s involvement in multiple roles and psychological distress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *49*, 135–145.
- Barnett, R.C., & Hyde, J.S. 2001. Women, men, work, and family. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 781–796.
- Barnett, R. C., Marshall, N. L., & Pleck, J. H. 1992. Men’s multiple roles and their relationship to men’s psychological distress. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *54*, 358–367.
- Barnett, R. C., Marshall, N. L., & Sayer, A. 1992. Positive- spillover effects from job to home: A closer look. *Women & Health*, *19*(2/3), 13–41.
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *14*(2), 103–118.
- Bhargava, S., & Baral, R. (2009). Antecedents and consequences of work-family enrichment among Indian managers. *Psychological Studies*, *54*(3), 213–225.

- Carlson, D., Kacmar, K. M., Zivnuska, S., Ferguson, M., & Whitten, D. (2011). Work-Family enrichment and job performance: A constructive replication of affective events theory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*(3), 297-312.
- Carlson, D., Kacmar, K.M., Wayne, J., Grywacz, J. (2006). Measuring the positive side of the work-family interface: Development and validation of a work-family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(1) 131-164.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Zivnuska, S., & Ferguson, M. (2015). Do the benefits of family-to-work transitions come at too great a cost? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 20*(2), 161-171.
- Daniel, S., & Sonnentag, S. (2014). Work to non-work enrichment: The mediating roles of positive affect and positive work reflection. *Work & Stress, 28*(1), 49-66.
- De Rijk, A. E., Blanc, P. M. L., Schaufeli, W. B., & De Jonge, J. (1998). Active coping and need for control as moderators of the job demand–control model: Effects on burnout. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 71*, 1–18.
- Duxbury, L., Stevenson, M., & Higgins, C. (2018). Too much to do, too little time: Role overload and stress in a multi-role environment. *International Journal of Stress Management, 25*(3), 250-266.
- Fuller, B., Jr., & Marler, L. E. (2009). Change driven by nature: A meta-analytic review of the proactive personality literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75*, 329–345.
- Frone, M. R., & Tidwell, M. O. (2015). The meaning and measurement of work fatigue: Development and evaluation of the three-dimensional work fatigue inventory (3D-WFI). *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 20*(3), 273-288.

- Greenhaus, J. & Foley, S. (2007). The intersection of work and family lives. In H. Gunz & M. Peiperl *Handbook of career studies* (pp. 131-152). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006) When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review, 31*, 72–92.
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work–family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*(1), 111-126.
- Hanson, G. C., Hammer, L. B., & Colton, C. L. (2006). Development and validation of a multidimensional scale of perceived work-family positive spillover. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*(3), 249-265.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*(3), 513-524.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1), 80-92.
- Kacmar, K. M., Crawford, W. S., Carlson, D. S., Ferguson, M., & Whitten, D. (2014). A short and valid measure of work-family enrichment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 19*(1), 32-45.

- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, D. J., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Kossek, E. E., Baltes, B. B., & Matthews, R. A. (2011). How work–family research can finally have an impact in organizations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 4(3), 352-359.
- Lapierre, L. M., Li, Y., Kwan, H. K., Greenhaus, J. H., DiRenzo, M. S., & Shao, P. (2018). A meta-analysis of the antecedents of work–family enrichment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(4), 385-401.
- Matthews, R. A., Winkel, D. E., & Wayne, J. H. (2014). A longitudinal examination of role overload and work–family conflict: The mediating role of interdomain transitions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(1), 72-91.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 400-410.
- Omar, A., Salessi, S., Vaamonde, J. D., & Urteaga, F. (2018). Core self-evaluations and work-family enrichment: The mediating role of distributive justice perceptions. *Psychologia: Avances De La Disciplina*, 12(1), 45-58.
- Ruderman, M.N., Ohlott, P.J., Panzer, K., & King, S.N. 2002. Benefits of multiple roles for managerial women. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 369-386.
- Searle, B. J., & Lee, L. (2015). Proactive coping as a personal resource in the expanded job demands–resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 22(1), 46-69.

- Sieber, S.D. 1974. Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review*, 39: 567-578.
- Seibert, S.E., Crant, J.M., & Kraimer, M.L. 1999. Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 416-427.
- Stephens, M. A. P., Franks, M. M., & Atienza, A. A. 1997. Where two roles intersect: Spillover between parent care and employment. *Psychology and Aging*, 12, 30–37.
- Siu, O. L., Bakker, A. B., Brough, P., Lu, C., Wang, H., Kalliath, T., Timms, C. (2015). A three-wave study of antecedents of work–family enrichment: The roles of social resources and affect. *Stress and Health: Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress*, 31(4), 306-314.
- Siu, O.-l., Lu, J.-f., Brough, P., Lu, C.-q., Bakker, A. B., Kalliath, T., ... Shi, K. (2010). Role resources and work family enrichment: The role of work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77, 470–480.
- Vieira, J. M., Matias, M., Lopez, F. G., & Matos, P. M. (2018). Work-family conflict and enrichment: An exploration of dyadic typologies of work-family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 109, 152-165.
- Voydanoff, P. (2001) Incorporating community into work and family research: A review of basic relationships. *Human Relations*, 54, 1609-1637.
- Wayne, J. H., Grzywacz, J. G., Carlson, D. S., & Kacmar, K. M. (2007). Work-family facilitation: A theoretical explanation and model of primary antecedents and consequences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 17(1), 63.

- Wayne, J. H., Randel, A. E., & Stevens, J. (2006). The role of identity and work-family support in work-family enrichment and its work-related consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*(3), 445-461.
- Weer, C. H., Greenhaus, J. H., & Linnehan, F. (2010). Commitment to nonwork roles and job performance: Enrichment and conflict perspectives. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 76*(2), 306-316.

Appendix A

Correlation Matrix

Table 1
Means, standard deviations, and correlations with confidence intervals

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5
<i>1. Role Categories</i>	2.37	1.02					
<i>2. Total Roles</i>	5.94	4.35	.45*				
<i>3. Proactive Behavior</i>	3.81	0.58	.06	.12			
<i>4. Proactive Coping</i>	3.60	0.64	-.04	.15*	.81*		
<i>5. Role Work enrichment</i>	3.91	0.80	.07	.13*	.46*	.42*	
<i>6. Role Family enrichment</i>	4.07	0.67	.13*	.11	.50*	.43*	.65*

n = 249. *M* and *SD* are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. * *p* < .05.

Moderated Regression Tables

Table 2
Moderated Regression Results for Proactive Behavior and Role Family Enrichment

	Number Role Categories			Number of Total Roles		
	Beta	R ²	ΔR ²	Beta	R ²	ΔR ²
Step 1		.258*	.258*		.252*	.252*
RA	.168			1.502		
PR	.485*			.623*		
Step 2		.259*	.000		.252*	.000
RA x PR	.063			-1.357		
Step 3		.259*	.001		.254*	.002
PR ²	-.084			-2.266		
Step 4		.259*	.000		.260*	.006
RA ² x PR	-.047			2.164		

Note. $n = 249$ RA = Role accumulation. PR = Proactive Behavior. Role accumulation was represented with number of categories on the left and total roles on the right. Regression coefficients are from the final model. * $p < .05$.

Table 3
Moderated Regression Results for Proactive Behavior and Role Work Enrichment

	Number Role Categories			Number of Total Roles		
	Beta	R^2	ΔR^2	Beta	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1		.213*	.213*		.217*	.217*
RA	-.092			.094		
PR	.427*			.426*		
Step 2		.218*	.004		.218*	.000
RA x PR	.134			.056		
Step 3		.218*	.000		.218*	.001
PR ²	.099			-.343		
Step 4		.219*	.000		.218*	.000
RA ² x PR	-.061			.274		

Note. $n = 249$. RA = Role accumulation. PR = Proactive Behavior. Role accumulation was represented with number of categories on the left and total roles on the right. Regression coefficients are from the final model. * $p < .05$.

Table 4
Moderated Regression Results for Proactive Coping and Role Family Enrichment

	Number Role Categories			Number of Total Roles		
	Beta	R ²	ΔR ²	Beta	R ²	ΔR ²
Step 1		.209*	.209*		.190*	.190*
RA	1.923			-1.147		
PC	.697*			.228*		
Step 2		.211*	.002		.211*	.021
RA x PC	-1.807			1.556*		
Step 3		.211*	.000		.228*	.017
PC ²	-2.150			.338		
Step 4		.217*	.005		.229*	.001
RA ² x PC	2.123			-.671		

Note. $n = 249$. RA = Role accumulation. PC = Proactive Coping. Role accumulation was represented with number of categories on the left and total roles on the right. Regression coefficients are from the final model. * $p < .05$.

Table 5
Moderated Regression Results for Proactive Coping and Role Work Enrichment

	Number Role Categories			Number of Total Roles		
	Beta	R^2	ΔR^2	Beta	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1		.186*	.186*		.182*	.182*
RA	1.397			-1.409		
PC	.703*			.212*		
Step 2		.186*	.000		.199*	.018
RA x PC	-1.544			1.726*		
Step 3		.187*	.002		.208*	.009
PC ²	-1.310			1.101		
Step 4		.190*	.003		.211*	.004
RA ² x PC	1.489			-1.323		

Note. $n = 249$. RA = Role accumulation. PC = Proactive Coping. Role accumulation was represented with number of categories on the left and total roles on the right. Regression coefficients are from the final model. * $p < .05$.

Appendix B

Measures and Items

Role Accumulation

1. How many active roles do you have in this category?
 - i. Religion: Church member, Church volunteer, Church Elder, etc.
 - ii. Leisure: Book club, Intramural Sports Club, Audubon society, etc.
 - iii. Community: PTA Member, HOA Board member, Community Watch, etc.
 - iv. Family: Parent, Spouse, Caretaker, etc.
 - v. Student: College Student, Student Government,
 - vi. Work: Manager, Receptionist, Resident Assistant, mTurker, etc.
2. Provide up to five text boxes for them to list out the different roles with instructions that if they have more than five, just list the top five
3. On average, how many hours a week do you spend on X role activities?

Role Specific Questions

Role commitment (adapted from Weer et al., 2010)

For the roles in X (family, community, religious, student, leisure, work), indicate how important it is in your life. (1 = unimportant, 5=very important).

Positive Affect

I enjoy the time I spend in my X roles. (Strongly Disagree-Strongly Agree)

Work Engagement (from Siu et al. 2010, adapted from Utrecht Work Engagement scale)

I find the time spent in my X roles full of meaning and purpose. (0=Never, 6=Every day)

Emotional Demands (based on Weer et al., 2010, adapted from Frone & Tidwell, 2015)

My time spent in my X roles leaves me mentally worn out.

Resource Acquisition (adapted from Weer et al., 2010)

To what extent have your involvement in X roles increased your confidence to be successful in other areas of your life? (1 = not at all, 5 = to a very great extent)

Role-Family Enrichment

My involvement in my other roles . . .

1. Helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me be a better family member.
2. Helps me to gain knowledge and this helps me be a better family member.
3. Helps me acquire skills and this helps me be a better family member.
4. Puts me in a good mood and this helps me be a better family member.
5. Makes me feel happy and this helps me be a better family member.
6. Makes me cheerful and this helps me be a better family member.
7. Helps me feel personally fulfilled and this helps me be a better family member.
8. Provides me with a sense of accomplishment and this helps me be a better family member.
9. Provides me with a sense of success and this helps me be a better family member.

My involvement in my other roles . . .

1. Helps me to gain knowledge and this helps me be a better worker.
2. Helps me acquire skills and this helps me be a better worker.
3. Helps me expand my knowledge of new things and this helps me be a better worker.
4. Puts me in a good mood and this helps me be a better worker.

5. Makes me feel happy and this helps me be a better worker.
6. Makes me cheerful and this helps me be a better worker.
7. Requires me to avoid wasting time at work and this helps me be a better worker.
8. Encourages me to use my work time in a focused manner and this helps me be a better worker.
9. Causes me to be more focused at work and this helps me be a better worker.

Work-Family Conflict

Other-Role-Family Conflict

1. The demands of my other roles interfere with my home and family life.
2. The amount of time my other activities takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities.
3. Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my other roles puts on me.
4. My other roles produce strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties.
5. Due to my other duties, I have to make changes to my plans for family activities.

Other-Role-Work Conflict

1. The demands of my other roles interfere with work-related activities.
2. I have to put off doing things at work because of demands from my other activities.
3. Things I want to do at work don't get done because of the demands of my other roles.
4. My other roles interfere with my responsibilities at work such as getting to work on time, accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime.

5. Strain from my other roles interferes with my ability to perform job-related duties.

Proactive Behavior

1. I am constantly on the lookout for new ways to improve my life.
2. I feel driven to make a difference in my community, and maybe the world.
3. I tend to let others take the initiative to start new projects.*
4. Wherever I have been, I have been a powerful force for constructive change.
5. I enjoy facing and overcoming obstacles to my ideas.
6. Nothing is more exciting than seeing my ideas turn into reality.
7. If I see something I don't like, I fix it.
8. No matter what the odds, if I believe in something I will make it happen.
9. I love being a champion for my ideas, even against others' opposition.
10. I excel at identifying opportunities.
11. I am always looking for better ways to do things.
12. If I believe in an idea, no obstacle will prevent me from making it happen.
13. I live to challenge the status quo.
14. When I have a problem, I tackle it head-on.
15. I am great at turning problems into opportunities.
16. I can spot a good opportunity long before others can.
17. If I see someone in trouble, I help out in any way I can.

* Reverse Scored

Proactive Coping

1. I am a "take charge" person.
2. I try to let things work out on their own. (-)

3. After attaining a goal, I look for another, more challenging one.
4. I like challenges and beating the odds.
5. I visualize my dreams and try to achieve them.
6. Despite numerous setbacks, I usually succeed in getting what I want.
7. I try to pinpoint what I need to succeed.
8. I always try to find a way to work around obstacles; nothing really stops me.
9. I often see myself failing so I don't get my hopes up too high. (-)
10. When I apply for a position, I imagine myself filling it.
11. I turn obstacles into positive experiences.
12. If someone tells me I can't do something, you can be sure I will do it.
13. When I experience a problem, I take the initiative in resolving it.
14. When I have a problem, I usually see myself in a no-win situation. (-)