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Abstract

Title: Actions Speak Louder than Words: The Role of Organization Segmentation Norms on Work-Family Enrichment, Engagement & Burnout

Author: Sarah Jensen

Advisor: Dr. Gary Burns

Increased frequency of virtual work environments has changed the dynamics of boundary management decisions for employees and underscored the importance of organizations being aware and purposeful of how their norms will impact their employees. The goal of this study was to a) understand how organizations norms towards segmentation impact employee burnout, engagement, and enrichment, and b) how segmentation preferences, job demands, and job crafting strengthen these relationships. Two samples of participants were recruited from a mental health organization (N = 73) and mTurk (N = 80) to complete surveys on the variables for the study. Organizations with a norm for segmentation have a positive impact on employee’s ability to manage the boundaries in their work and family domains, and are associated with reduced levels of burnout, and higher levels of engagement and enrichment with family. Although individuals differ in their preference for segmentation, this study supports the idea that a preference for segmentation is associated with increased well-being, engagement at work, and positive experiences with family. Because people-facing job roles can often lead to higher job demands, it is necessary for employees to have an understanding of what tools or efforts they can take to positively impact their environment, along with what types of organizational segmentation norms align with their boundary management.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The rise of virtual work arrangements has led to a blurring of boundaries between work and personal life for many individuals. Traditional views regarding work taking place outside the home, with the home being a place of refuge from job demands, have been on a steep decline over the past several decades (Ammons, 2013). Other factors such as globalization, growing non-traditional schedules, and technology development (cell phones, internet and laptops) all have hastened this shift into an increasingly intertwined relationship between an employees’ roles (Bulger et al., 2007). Employees working past the end of their day, addressing tasks during non-work time and having difficulty differentiating between their roles are all commonplace in today’s work culture which has brought to light the importance organizations have on the norms they promote for employees to manage the boundaries between their domains.

It’s a picture many know well, especially over the past few years as the number of those working virtually has skyrocketed (Bulger et al., 2007). Even though virtual work and the dynamics surrounding them have been a source of research from numerous disciplines, the pandemic only furthered this interest as the motivation behind understanding it amplified. What once provided a physical distance between the two, the segmentation between work and family became blurred for many trying to make decisions in managing the boundaries between these two domains (Wayne et al., 2022). What once wasn’t a conscious consideration, many were now faced with thinking about when to end their workday, what their organization expected of them, and whether they were allowed to attend to family matters during work hours, to name a few. Individuals often made these decisions based on a perception of their organization’s norms for segmentation, taking note of what other colleagues and their organization as a whole were doing
and promoting. Individuals experienced impacts on well-being and declining engagement but also positive aspects such as enrichment as families got to spend more time together (Wayne et al., 2022).

These outcomes understandably depend on a multitude of factors such as how an individual respond to expectations of them, individual differences, job demands, and how they utilize available resources to mitigate potential stressors and strain. Individuals who were in roles with high job demands, for example, might see more of an effect on the enrichment they experience in their family domain. Additionally, if individuals have a specific preference for how they manage their boundaries or choose to try to manipulate how they structure their work tasks to decrease strain, these factors might also affect the outcome of these organizational norms. Organizations' having expectations of employees after hours is often harmful, and this in combination with other factors can impact the outcomes on both employees and organizations (Bulger et al., 2007). These organizational segmentation norms can influence an employee’s perceived ability to segment their domains in a way that works for them. This study will explore the relationship between segmentation norms and work-family enrichment, burnout and engagement and the effects of job demands, segmentation preferences and job crafting in moderating these relationships.

Even though all employees are impacted by organizations that either aren’t clear about their segmentation environment, or promote an environment of integration, for those in the mental health or helping professions, this impact has been especially hard felt (Kaillaith et al., 2022). Many employees follow the lead of their organization when making decisions regarding boundary management, either by choice or expectation. Mental health roles are widely acknowledged as high demand with constant change, stress and uncertainty (Kaillaith et al.,
The increasing reliance on telehealth services have eroded the previous barriers once provided by organization, often leaving employees to figure out what the segmentation expectations of their organization are when they work outside of an office setting.

These professionals often experience a complex combination of work-related stressors, as well as external influences that can have an impact on their practice (Kaillaith et al., 2022). Setting boundaries between work and family roles has its difficulties for these types of employees due to the nature of the work but removing the physical boundaries of a separate work location or introducing the use of personal phones used for work during off work hours and this becomes even more difficult. As more agencies, practices and practitioners embrace telehealth services, the lines between personal and work roles become increasingly blurred (Allen et al., 2014). These changes have perpetuated an environment of work intensification for many mental health professionals, and an expectation of needing to work anywhere at any time. Although individuals differ in their response to organizational norms and job demands, many at least initially attempt to ‘solve’ these disparities by increasing their available resources or job crafting (Tims et al., 2012).

Even though there are individual differences between preferences to segment, most people benefit from some level of segmentation (Kossek et al., 2012). Despite this preference, there are other contextual factors that can impact their overall willingness and ability to enact boundaries between these two domains (Allen et al., 2014). Organization segmentation norms, or organizational norms on what level of segmentation is expected of employees, are an important consideration, and how these expectations impact their ability to segment or integrate between domains. Another consideration is an individual’s family domain. Just as someone may prefer to
keep their work and family domain separated, another may appreciate the ability to do both at the same time.

The potential for conflict is understandably high if an organization’s segmentation norm is at odds with an individual segmentation preference and they are left to manage boundaries in a manner that may not feel authentic to them (Kreiner, 2006). Boundary management theory helps to explain how individuals go about segmenting and enact borders or “walls” around domains, such as work and family, to protect one from the other (Bulger et al., 2007). Imagining how these walls may be taller than others, made of different materials, or have more permeability allows us to understand how such walls vary on a situational and daily basis, and can be difficult to pinpoint where the boundary originates from. Although research has shown that people tend to enact boundaries between their domains proactively rather than reactively, the strength and flexibility of these boundaries is an important aspect of how segmented or integrated a person’s work and family domains are (Kreiner, 2006). Understanding the varying nature of boundaries and segmentation preferences helps us understand their impact on the dynamic between individuals and other domains.

Segmentation and integration have been conceptualized as two opposite approaches on a continuum of work-life balance (Kreiner, 2006). Whereas segmentation typically refers to a preference towards more stringent boundaries between domains, these people strive to keep as many aspects of work separated from home and adopt a mentality of “work stays at work.” Integration, on the other hand, involves a lack of boundaries or blending between domains. Individuals with this preference might invite co-workers to spend time with family, talk about family at work, and have more permeable barriers between the two (Ashforth et al., 2000). Understandably, individual differences also play a role in segmentation preference and whether
individuals view the environment their organization promotes towards segmentation or integration as in line or against their preference (Yang et al., 2019).

Using conservation of resource and boundary management theory to conceptualize how segmentation norms and preferences affect both the work-family domains and engagement allows us to have more insight into the multiple factors that can affect these dynamics (Ashforth et al., 2000; Hobfoll, 1990). Understanding how individuals manage boundaries between their domains and its impact on outcomes such as engagement, work-family conflict and work-family enrichment can be beneficial to organizations and employees to optimize productivity. In light of the COVID-19 pandemic, there has been a dramatic increase in employees who are now working remotely and faced with managing boundaries between their domains where they hadn’t before (Vaziri, 2020). These place added pressure on our ability to understand how segmentation norms and preferences can impact work-family domains, and ultimately what combination leads to higher levels of engagement.

The purpose of this study is to investigate how an organization’s segmentation norms impact work-family enrichment, engagement and burnout, and whether these relationships are moderated by job crafting, job demands and segmentation preferences using boundary, border, and conservation of resources theories. Even though segmentation norms have been discussed alongside work-family and individual outcomes before, changes such as the recent pandemic have changed the lens, we view these dynamics in (Kaillaith et al., 2022). In an office or in-person setting, people are physically more segmented between work and family domains, but with more individuals transitioning or embracing virtual work they are now faced with more variables impacting their boundary management and resulting outcomes. An individual who doesn’t respond to phone calls or emails on the weekend and a supervisor or colleague that
expects this can result in negative impacts on an employee’s well-being or commitment to the organization. Conversely, an individual who works from home and is able to interact more with their children or spouse throughout the day might have increased positive impacts such as enrichment. Incorporating individual differences, proactive coping strategies, and job demands into this discussion ties in aspects of resource depletion and how people can use their own resources to help mitigate stressors and strain. This study’s focus on how organization segmentation environments predict these relationships adds necessary clarification to the many nuances and layers that shape an individual’s boundary management preference. Work-family literature is largely dominated by cross-sectional studies, and longitudinal studies examining how these variables change over time are needed to increase our understanding (Casper et al., 2007).

This study adds necessary clarity to the complex dynamics involved in how individuals choose to manage their boundaries between work and family and specifically, how an organization's norms for segmentation influence their outcomes of work family enrichment, engagement and burnout. By including the moderators of job demands, segmentation preferences and job crafting, it will add an understanding of how individual level factors, stressful workplace events, and proactive behavior on the part of the individual can influence these outcomes.

Model
Chapter 2

Literature review

This chapter will review the relevant literature surrounding the psychological constructs of interest and discuss the relevant psychological theories driving this work. Presentation of the hypothesis used in this study are presented in the final section.

**Segmentation Norms & Preferences**

Possibly more salient now than ever, how individuals manage the boundaries between domains in their life can dramatically alter the functioning and impact they have within those domains (Ashforth et al., 2000). As many individuals today are involved in multiple roles within their life, the intersection and integration between these can be complicated and impacted by a variety of factors (Bulger et al., 2007). Organization’s expectations or norms for individuals during non-work time can understandably impact how they make decisions about how much to segment or integrate the boundaries between their domains (Van Laethem et al., 2018). Research on boundary management spans multiple disciplines and typically focuses on the outcomes of this as they have important impacts on both individuals and organizations. The idea that individuals are purposeful in the way they manage the boundaries between their roles, and actively construct these to suit their needs isn’t a new one (Nippert-Eng, 1996). While some may prefer these boundaries stay rigid and separate, others may not mind if they are flexible and more permeable. How and why an individual chooses to create boundaries which are either segmented or integrated depends on multiple factors, including; industry, family size and dynamics, coworkers, organizational culture and individual preferences (Bulger et al., 2007).

Work-family segmentation preferences refer to the extent one prefers to separate different aspects of work and family from one another by creating more or less impermeable boundaries
around the work and family domains (Kreiner, 2006). Due to the various factors that may impact an individual’s desire or ability to create and maintain boundaries between their domains, segmentation preference can also be conceptualized as a continuum (Nippert-Eng, 1996). Individuals may experience more segmented boundaries when there is lower perceived or actual flexibility and permeability between their work and family domains. Contrarily, they may experience more integration when there is high perceived or actual flexibility and high permeability between domains. When boundaries are characterized as flexible or permeable, it results in more aspects of one domain in another (Bulger et al., 2007). For example, after an especially stressful week full of increased job demands, an individual may choose to enact stronger boundaries between their domains in order to protect their remaining resources. Contrarily, during periods of lower job demands or stress, an individual may choose to answer emails during nonwork time or invite a coworker to a social event.

Flexibility describes an individual’s ability to hypothetically relax a previously set boundary to meet the demands of one domain, while in another domain (Bulger et al, 2007). Although it does entail an aspect of individual control, the hypothetical or perceived component to the flexibility of a boundary encompasses not only an individual’s willingness to attend to one domain while in another, but also their ability to do so (Mathews & Barnes-Farrell, 2004). This could look like a decision to leave work early, manage a family need or decide to work from home instead of traveling to the office. Permeability refers to how often and how many elements of one domain are found in the other domain (Bulgar et al., 2007). It is characterized by being physically located in one domain, but behaviorally or emotionally responding to stimuli from another domain. These can be actual interruptions or intrusions, in which the individual may not have any control or perceived control over. This may look like being worried about a sick child
at work or a work meeting running late and interfering with a family event. Because there are various factors that can impact both the permeability and flexibility of a boundary, individuals may find themselves shifting between periods of integration and segmentation to meet their own personal needs and the needs of their domain roles.

Antecedents of segmentation preference include an individual’s ability or willingness to be flexible, permeation of domains across each other, organizational segmentation norms and individual differences such as self-efficacy (Bulger et al., 2007). There are many aspects of segmentation and integration that ultimately affect the amount of segmentation or integration an individual desires and is able to have. Contributors such as individual differences, group and organization segmentation norms and strength or flexibility all play a role in how able an individual is able to align their preferences with their environment (Kreiner, 2006).

Individuals often differ in their preferences relating to whether or not they segment or integrate their work and family domains and also whether they experience enrichment or conflict as a result of their level of segmentation (Yang et al., 2019). While some may report strain as a result of managing boundaries between multiple roles, others may report little or no strain in a similar dynamic (Marks & MacDermid, 1996). Research shows that individuals typically take an active rather than passive approach to organizing the roles and boundaries in their life, which may help to explain the positive and negative outcomes they may experience as they then try to balance these roles (Bulger et al., 2007; Nippert-Eng, 1996). While some may choose to construct these boundaries in a deliberate and rigid manner, others may leave them more flexible and able to change. When an individual chooses to develop and enforce a clear boundary between their work and family roles, they reduce the impact their work has on their family and vice versa (Nippert-Eng, 1996). Granted, this impact can either be positive or negative, as some
individuals prefer a more integrated interaction between their domains, so they are able to have more carryover of resources or positive effects between work and family. Individuals with this preference are referred to as “integrators,” as they prefer a more permeable boundary between their work and family domains (Kreiner, 2006). “Segmenters,” on the other hand, prefer more impermeable boundaries that keep work and family domains separate. This individual preference informs the way they choose to manage the roles and activities at work and home.

This boundary preference refers to where people fall on a continuum ranging from integration and overlap of work and nonwork roles and segmentation and separation of work and nonwork roles. Kossek et al (2006) describes this as people having not just having a preference, but as an implicit way they like to intertwine work and family, and that this reflects not just their values, but the realities of their life. Even though the way individuals choose to manage and enact the boundaries between their domains is unique to each individual and the dynamics between their domains, there is evidence of common patterns of behavior (Bulgar et al., 2007). A cluster analysis performed by Bulgar et al. (2007) indicates support for the segmentation-integration continuum, although it suggests that this relationship may be more complicated than originally theorized. Although there were four cluster profiles that emerged from this study, none of these were particularly strong towards either end of the spectrum and open to subjective interpretation.

When individuals decide to enact a boundary between their domains, they often use boundary tactics to do so (Kreiner et al., 2009). These are an attempt to protect their separate domains from intrusions from the other and can be broken up into four categories; temporal, physical, communicative, and behavioral tactics. Temporal tactics are focused on allocating specific amounts of time or time periods towards work or family. Physical tactics are focused on
behaviors that create an actual distance or proximity from one's work and family domain. Especially for virtual workers, this may mean only working at a desk or office or designated working corner while working from home. Communicative tactics are focused on verbally setting expectations for others regarding what they can expect from you regarding working times, etc. Lastly, behavioral tactics are focused on using things such as technology to aid in separating work and family domains. This could be screening work calls using caller identification, or deactivating work emails during family time. All of these tactics can help individuals psychologically detach from work during non-work hours, allowing for recovery and replenishment of resources (Kreiner et al, 2009).

An individual’s preference for integration or segmentation has obvious implications for their work and family roles and there is some disagreement in the literature regarding whether integration actually leads to more conflict or whether it can be helpful for balancing more than one role (Kossek et al., 2006). Although there are researchers who have looked at the relationship between segmentation preference and negative outcomes such as work-family conflict (Kreiner, 2006; Kreiner et al., 2009), there is only one that addressed the positive side of work-family dynamics as an outcome (Chen et al., 2008). All of these studies took into account the “fit” between an individual’s segmentation preference and the norm of the work environment. Chen et al (2008) found when people’s segmentation preferences were aligned with their organization there was a positive relationship between positive spillover from an instrumental standpoint, but a negative relationship for affective spillover. The environmental influence over an individual’s segmentation preferences is helpful in understanding whether this leads to positive or negative outcomes.
Different teams or work groups have their own norms related to how segmented or integrated they are, and individual employees are likely to be influenced by these collective norms (Park et al., 2011). After witnessing their work group’s segmentation norms, individuals may make efforts to follow the same norms as their work group. Group segmentation norms are defined as the amount of awareness of team members’ consensus of how segmentation their group is between work and family domains (Park et al., 2011). When an individual employee is aware of how their coworker or manager are enacting boundaries between their work and family domains, it affects their decision on how segmented they are between their domains. If an individual prefers to be highly segmented, but their work group norm is integration, internal or external conflict can arise. If several coworkers decide to work through lunch, for example, it adds increased pressure on an employee to also decide to work through lunch rather than keeping a boundary between that time and work time.

Segmentation criteria for the work group can be informal or formal, but ultimately sets the expectation for all members (Yang et al., 2019). Another consideration regarding these group norms, is the strength of the norm. A work group may have a strong norm of segmentation between work and family, where they do not expect a response to an email until the following day, for example, whereas another work group may have a weak norm of segmentation and at times expect an individual to spend time during off-work time on work tasks. This behavior can be explained by social learning theory (Bandura, 1978), where individuals tend to mirror or imitate the behavior of others around them.

In addition to group level segmentation norms, organizational segmentation norms also impact an individual’s actual segmentation or integration (Ashforth et al., 2000). Organizations can vary greatly in their norms or expectations for employee availability outside of work hours.
(Derks et al., 2014). The literature often discusses segmentation decisions as if they are simply a matter of free will (Foucreault et al., 2018). Even though there have been theorized implications of an organization’s culture influencing a person’s resulting level of segmentation, there is a lack of empirical studies measuring the effects of this influence (Kreiner et al, 2009). Both the climate of the organization and the perceptions and attitudes of colleagues and managers help shape what types of boundary management behaviors are normative and create perceived penalties if an individual chooses to act against these norms. These can be both informal and formal policies, and similar to the group segmentation norms, influence an individual’s decisions for their own level of segmentation. An important aspect about group level and organizational level segmentation norms is the difference between ability and accommodation (Kreiner et al, 2009). An organization may have a formal policy regarding being able to take phone calls after hours or on weekends as part of the job duties. An individual who prefers to segment in this environment may not have the ability to do so to the extent they wish, as there is a formal expectation that promotes integration. However, a work group that prefers to communicate after hours or on weekends may impact an individual’s segmentation based more on informal practices (Derks et al, 2014). They may choose to accommodate and integrate their work and family domains more as that is the norm of the group, even if this is not their preference. Formal and informal criteria for how an individual segments or integrates is created for all employees in an organization.

**Theory**

Initially developed as a means to conceptualize how individuals navigate between different domains, boundary theory is the natural fit for explaining how they go about segmenting or integrating these domains by continuously creating, maintaining and modifying boundaries (Bulger et al., 2007; Nippert-Eng, 1996). The idea is that individuals develop
boundaries around their work and family domains in an effort to separate each from the other (Ashforth et al., 2000) in an enactive rather than a reactive manner (Clark, 2000). This is looked at as a personal characteristic and is a person’s preference on how they separate the domains in their life. These boundaries vary in their strength, which then influences the resulting interactions between these domains. Whether an interaction is positive or negative has the potential to result in either work-family conflict, or work-family enrichment.

Boundary theory is the predominant theory used to explain the mechanisms behind segmentation norms and preferences (Ashforth et al., 2000; Nippert-Eng, 1996; Yang et al., 2019). Originally proposed by Nipper-Eng (1996), it explains how the boundaries between a person’s work and family domains can impact the availability and transfer of resources. These boundaries can be broken down into behavioral, mental, spatial and physical depending on what they relate to (Nippert-Eng, 1996). Mental boundaries are determined by a person’s thoughts, opinions and values, spatial refers to the geographic distance between a person’s personal and workspaces, behavioral refers to not taking on tasks outside of work hours, and physical refers to the separation from colleagues, manager or clients after work hours. Individuals are able to enact boundaries between work and family in a way that helps them manage their demands and responsibilities in each of those areas (Nippert-Eng, 1996). Boundaries between domains allow an individual to have expected and regulated dynamics they can rely on, although the ease of doing so is related to the degree of segmentation or integration between their work and family domains. Even though the primary benefit of segmenting is having clear boundaries between domains, this may come as a detriment to the individual as the ease of transitions between domains may be hindered (Ashforth et al, 2000). Integration, conversely, can result in smooth transitions between domains which can make attending to demands from each easier for the
individual. There seems to be a cost-benefit tradeoff between segmentation and integration, where benefits gained by choosing one end of the continuum are accompanied by costs of that same choice (Nippert-Eng, 1996). Although boundary theory is the overarching theory that encompasses segmentation preferences, there are also other theories that allow us to understand the underlying mechanisms that lead an individual to segment or integrate their domains (Methot & Lepine, 2016).

Border theory is also helpful in understanding the types of boundaries that individuals enact during work-family segmentation (Clark, 2000). The tenets of this theory pertain mostly to the nature and strength of a border between work and family. Imagining a tangible representation of this idea, a real-life border could be made of different materials (wood, rock, brick), have a gate that could be closed at times, or thicker in some parts than others. The border is the hypothetical line in the sand that an individual draws to keep their work domain separated to a degree from their family domain. Although there are many overlapping concepts between border and boundary theory, both individually help explain the dynamics at play when an individual segments or integrates their domains. Ultimately, the strength of the boundary is what impacts various outcomes of the interaction between an individual’s work and family domain (Bulger et al., 2007).

**Work-Family Enrichment**

Research on the dynamics between work and family began in the 1980s, prompted in part by the increase in dual-earner couples and couples caring for multigenerational family members. The events of recent years have yet again caused an increase in the changes taking place for employees’ work and family roles, and the factors that contribute to outcomes such as enrichment (Lapierre et al., 2017).
Although the original focus of this interface was mostly on conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985), in time the pendulum has swung the other way, and research on the positive benefits and resources that can arise out of these two domains is being increasingly explored (Carlson et al., 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Although there have been multiple constructs (positive spillover, facilitation, enhancement) describing the positive effects of work-family dynamics, enrichment has remained one of the most frequently studied, and is defined by Greenhaus and Powell (2006) as “the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role” (p.73). Constructs such as spillover involve both a positive and negative transfer of resources and look at how individuals can use resources from one domain to fill a need in another domain (Hanson et al., 2006), whereas facilitation focuses more on how the involvement in one domain provides an enhanced functioning in another domain (Wayne et al., 2007). Although similar in some respects, these constructs are different not only by what the focus of measurement is but also in how the transfer of resources is conceptualized. Enrichment is looking specifically at the individual as the unit of analysis, versus a systems-level family perspective, and focuses on resources gained in each domain and the manner in which they are transferred between the two.

Despite enrichment almost solely discussed in the literature from a work and family perspective, it can also be conceptualized from a work and other life domain view (Daniel & Sonnentag, 2014). Enrichment in one's personal life carries over from the work domain and can understandably impact those who may not be married, have children, or live alone in a similar manner as those with families (Wayne et al., 2007). Someone who experiences a positive event at work, like a promotion or completion of a project may experience enrichment from increased financial assets in their personal life or positive effect when they celebrate with friends after
work. This brings to light a need for literature to reflect a more broad and diverse definition of family and work roles to include those who may not fall into more traditional models. Expanding this view to include a wider range of societal and demographic backgrounds helps to reduce unfairness for those that aren’t included in traditional definitions in tandem with increasing the ability for results to be applied to a wider range of the general population.

Empirical and theoretical literature indicate that, like the overall work-family dynamic, work-family enrichment exhibits a bidirectional relationship and that these directions should be looked at separately (Carlson et al., 2006; LaPierre et al., 2017). Work to family enrichment (WFE) occurs when resources that are gained in the work domain positively influence the experience in the family domain, and similarly, family to work enrichment (FWE) occurs when resources gained in the family domain positively influence the experience in the work domain. A helpful way to conceptualize this bidirectionality is to think about where the enrichment is precipitating from (Frone, 2003). Looking at these domains from a bidirectional nature is also useful for addressing the often-reciprocal nature of work and family, as work can positively impact family, which in turn positively impacts work, and so on (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Studying these dynamics from a domain-specific perspective allows us to understand the unique characteristics that may be present when we look at the outcomes of this interaction. Understandably, work-specific characteristics such as supervisor or organizational support will be more beneficial to the work to family enrichment direction than to the family to work enrichment direction and exploring these in silo allows us to understand their unique contributions. This study will look at both of these directions as an outcome of organizational segmentation norms.
As the benefits of the work-family dynamic are innumerable, it is helpful to understand the different factors that enable enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). There are currently three meta-analyses that explore the antecedents of work-family enrichment; one focusing on the Big Five Personality traits (Michel et al., 2011), the second focusing on the perception of leader-member exchange (Litano et al., 2016), and the third focusing on determinants of work-family enrichment that have primarily been studied for work-family conflict. Although helpful in providing context, they are not exhaustive in explaining some of the other, relevant contextual determinants of this dynamic. Factors such as support received at work and home, an organizational culture that promotes family-friendly policies, and marital status are all aspects of an employee’s life that can possibly lead to them experiencing work-family enrichment (Wayne et al., 2007). Other personal factors aside from personality have also been explored, including the amount of psychological investment a person has in each domain (LaPierre et al., 2017). An individual who is “career focused” or “family focused” may intentionally direct more energy or effort to one role, and therefore affect the functioning or outcomes of the other role.

**Theory**

Although multiple theoretical models have been proposed over the years to explain the underlying mechanisms of work-family enrichment, several have emerged as the dominating models for understanding these dynamics (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Grzywacz et al., 2007; Wayne et al., 2007). Conservation of resource theory (Hobfoll, 2003) has been the long-standing theory to describe work and family relationships, but when looking at work-family enrichment specifically, enhancement theory is a helpful addition to this foundation (Sieber, 1974). Enhancement theory proposes that people engaged in more than one role can have more positive outcomes such as physical, mental and social than those that have fewer roles. Greenhaus and
Powell (2006) expand on this earlier work by underscoring the importance of the generation of resources in the facilitation of enrichment and how these resources can be categorized into different types depending on what they offer the person.

The high-level takeaway of these theories’ centers around the idea that there is an acquisition of resources in one domain (ex: work) that is then used in the other domain (ex: family) to improve the quality of that domain (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). These resources can be broken down into several categories to further understand the unique contribution they offer (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). These can be skills and perspectives, social-capital resources such as information or influence, flexibility such as pace or timing, location the work and family domains take place, material resources such as money, benefits, or rewards, and lastly, psychological and physical resources such as self-efficacy, optimism and physical health. Other researchers (Grywacz et al., 2007) offer additional resources they describe as catalysts, which can be things such as gains in efficiency, positive emotions, or social and health assets.

In addition to understanding the various types of resources that can be transferred, it is also important to understand the means, method, or path that these resources are carried over from one domain to the other (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). These two paths are described as instrumental or affective, although can also be described as coming from both paths at the same time. The instrumental path outlines how resources, such as skills, values and abilities, that are gained in one role, have a direct effect on performance in the other role. For example, this could be an individual who gains a skillset in project management at work and in turn uses this to organize a vacation for their family. The affective path refers to resources gained in one role having a positive effect on a person’s affect, such as self-confidence, self-esteem or self-conceptualization, which can then increase performance in the other role. For example, this could
be an individual completing a special assignment at work where they gained self-confidence and that feeling of confidence carried into their family life where they started a task, they hadn’t felt confident doing before.

These antecedents of enrichment can be grouped into two broad categories; contextual characteristics and personal characteristics (Lapierre et al., 2017). Although there is some variation in these terms by different researchers (Greenhaus & Powell (2006) refer to contextual characteristics as role characteristics, and Brummelhuis & Bakker (2012) refer to personal characteristics as key resources), these overarching categories help provide clarity to the literature. Contextual characteristics refer to a role’s social or environment context, such as having work resources like autonomy at work, seniority in the organization, or a supportive supervisor that can lead to gaining resources that enrich a person’s family domain. These types of characteristics as antecedents are focusing on aspects of the person’s environment that are resource-providing and have the ability to enable enrichment (Wayne et al., 2007). Following the example above, if a person has a supportive supervisor, this may lend itself to feeling happy to go to work or increasing job-specific knowledge through them. Although not the focus of this study, it is worth mentioning that conflict between work and family can result in either lost resources between these two domains, or resource depletion that exceeds the resources gained (Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). This speaks to the importance of understanding the strength that various resources provide, as a person can be simultaneously experiencing resource-providing and resource-depleting characteristics, with the outcome being determined by the quantity and strength of each individual resource. Lapierre et al. (2017) looked at the comparison of negative relationships between resource-depleting characteristics and enrichment and positive relationships between these same characteristics and conflict and found support for a weaker
relationship between enrichment. This provides support for our understanding that the processes vary between conflict and enrichment, with resource-providing characteristics being more related to enrichment (Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012).

Personal characteristics encompass the psychological aspects related to a role, such as how engaged a person is at work, or how involved they are with their family (Lapierre et al., 2017). These can also be domain-free characteristics, however, such as personality traits like conscientiousness, openness, or optimism. These characteristics differ between individuals and refer to the unique aspects of oneself that allow them to look for opportunities to develop opportunities, experience positive emotions or gain assets and ultimately make the most of their contextual characteristics (Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012; Wayne et al., 2007). The personal characteristics of work family enrichment antecedents capture how individual differences between people can greatly affect the amount or level of enrichment they are afforded between their roles.

In general, individual differences have been a relatively neglected area in work-family research, especially in terms of work family enrichment (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 2002). Ammons (2013) discusses the necessity to also look at how people interpret demands in each domain. Whereas researchers might assume that an interruption in one domain would be perceived negatively and cause problems, it’s important to remember that not everyone would agree on what an intrusion even is to begin with. The subjective appraisal of demands in both work and family varies widely based on the person and is a necessary component to understanding how they feel as a result of it. Despite little research being done surrounding how individuals may differ in their perception or experience of enrichment, there is some evidence
regarding dispositional characteristics like positive affectivity (Michel & Clark, 2009) and core self-evaluations (McNall et al., 2011) being an important factor.

A final differentiator worth noting in relation to characteristics of work family enrichment are demand characteristics, which refer to aspects of a person's environment that demand a particular response (Wayne et al., 2007). An example of this is gender, and although the argumentation relating to this is debatable, suggests people may have more role salience with one domain over another, based on their gender. Historically, women may have more role salience with family, and men may have more role salience with work, which could have an impact on their respective ability to gain resources at the same level as the other gender in these domains (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

Due to work family enrichment's relatively recent entrance in the work-family literature there is more work needed to establish various outcomes (McNall et al., 2015). Positioning enrichment as a possible buffer against stress and negative outcomes of work-family dynamics means establishing a stronger tie to positive outcomes of well-being. Out of all the outcomes, satisfaction has been one of the most frequently studied and it is generally agreed that people who report higher levels of enrichment also report higher levels of job, family and life satisfaction. A meta-analysis by Nicklin & Masuda (2010) showed employees who experience work family enrichment benefit from increased satisfaction at work and home, organizational commitment, decreased turnover and overall better mental and physical health. Outcomes of work-family enrichment have previously been shown to surpass the negative effects of work-family conflict (Wayne et al., 2006).

For the purpose of this study, conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 2003) will be the primary theory used to conceptualize work family enrichment, in addition to a specific focus on
the instrumental path as a means of transferring resources between the work and family domains as it relates to organizational segmentation norms acting as a resource for individuals (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

**Burnout**

The concept of burnout emerged in the literature around the 1970s, in an attempt to explain energy depletion at work (Dishon-Berkovits, 2014). Burnout is one of the most frequently studied outcomes of the work-family domains (Merecz & Andysz, 2014) and can be defined as a “syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do ‘people work’ of some kind” (Maslach, 1982). In organizations, burnout is seen as contagious, both with the ability to impact other employees but also to spillover into people’s home lives and negatively affect their family or nonwork roles and activities (Maslach, 2003; Maslach et al., 2001). This topic has gained understandable attention over the years, as the outcomes of employees experiencing burnout can result in; mental health conditions, substance use, decreased performance and higher frequency of physical health conditions (Alarcon, 2011; Maslach et al., 2001). Although research on burnout originally began as a result of studying employees in human services, this definition has expanded over the years to include employees in any occupation. Burnout can be conceptualized as emotional exhaustion and is an affective response to ongoing or prolonged exposure to stress (Maslach et al., 2001).

Work today looks drastically different than it did fifty years ago. The boundaries between work and family have become increasingly blurred, as people today have access to communication during non-work hours, work more hours, and experience work as more intense (Kelliher & Anderson, 2009). Working more hours, being accessible via devices, and constantly
checking work-related communication leads people to feel as if they are always on the clock. Not only can this make it difficult for people to disengage from work but can also lead to feeling exhausted from constant attention and demands (Derks et al., 2015). This prolonged exhaustion, without a shift or intervention can ultimately leave people to experience burnout.

Literature on antecedents of burnout typically focus on conditions that occur within the organization and separate them into two working conditions that can lead to burnout; low resources and high demands (Dishon-Berkovits, 2014). Job resources include job control, job variety, a positive social climate, and autonomy. Job demands can include workload, organizational policies, role ambiguity and workload. Despite most of the focus centering around conditions within the organization, there is evidence that suggests conditions outside of work can also be antecedents of burnout (Derks et al., 2015). The work family dynamic has been studied in relation to burnout not only from a factor that can facilitate burnout, but also from one that is able to protect against it. An individual’s management of their demands in work and family domains leads to a loss of resources, and if this resource depletion is not counteracted by resource gain, can result in burnout. Burnout can have detrimental outcomes for both the individual and the organization (Dishon-Berkovits, 2014). Individuals experiencing burnout can start experiencing depression, anxiety, substance use and health problems. For organizations, this can result in employees having decreased job performance, satisfaction, commitment or increased turnover.

**Theory**

Like work family enrichment, conservation of resources theory (COR) (Hobfoll, 2002) is often used to describe the tenets of burnout or strain and will be the primary theory used to conceptualize burnout for this study. At its core, conservation of resource theory is about stress
and coping, and how motivated an individual is to obtain, retain, foster and protect their 
resources (Hobfoll, 2011). Strain, or burnout can occur when these resources are not gained at a 
pace to replenish those that are lost, are lost and not replenished, or are threatened (Alcaron, 
2011). These resources can be broken down into different categories; objects such as a tool, or a 
car or house, conditions such as being a parent, receiving social support from a supervisor, 
personal skills such as skills or traits or emotional stability, and energy such as money, or 
knowledge and experience. When a person is threatened with loss of these resources, actually 
loses them or they are not gained, this is represented by a demand from a conservation of 
resource point of view. These demands and resources can be conceptualized as a balancing scale, 
where the fewer the resources they have to use and the higher the demands they experience can 
result in maladaptive coping strategies. If these maladaptive strategies persist for a period of 
time, it increases the likelihood that they will experience burnout which can lead to poor 
organizational attitudes and commitment (Alcaron, 2011). A prolonged experience of high 
demands and low resources essentially erodes other resources (either stored or gained), such as 
energy, efficacy, or identification (Hobfoll et al., 1990). These experiences are especially 
impactful in situations that are considered high demand, such as mental health workers or 
frontline workers.

There are three different scenarios that can lead to stress developing and result in burnout 
according to conservation of resource theory. When an individual loses resources, such as losing 
a job, or a work relationship they value, it can impact their actual or perceived availability of 
resources. Similarly, when there is a threat that they will lose resources, such as rumors that 
layoffs or downsizing will happen, or a partner worrying about job stability. Finally, when 
individuals feel there is not enough expected gain in resources for the amount of effort they are
putting in, it can result in stress or strain. Individuals may utilize a variety of strategies to protect the resources they have, and when these resources are threatened will often initially invest more resources in an attempt to maintain against the threat. Although conservation of resource theory is often discussed in terms of a lack of resources leading to stress and subsequently burnout, it is also conceptualized as a way that resources can offset negative outcomes (Hobfoll, 1990).

According to Maslach et al.’s (1997) model, burnout is conceptualized as having three dimensions; emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced personal accomplishments. Emotional exhaustion relates to feeling empty, worn out, or spent, with a lack of emotional or physical resources to use. This is the first step in the process of burnout and is a result of resource depletion (Alarcon, 2011). Cynicism occurs next, as a maladaptive coping strategy in an attempt to deal with the demands which are exceeding a lack of resources. Cynicism relates to being disconnected, detached, or experiencing depersonalization when trying to respond to work demands. The final step occurs as there is a reduced sense of personal accomplishment as a result of increased cynicism. This reduced personal accomplishment relates to feelings of incompetence, lack of achievement or lower than expected performance in comparison to the effort expended. This sequence of events causes resource loss to spiral downwards, as the burnout process worsens. As a contrast to work family enrichment, conservation of resources theory applied to burnout would explain it as a loss of resources caused by trying to meet role demands that exceeded a person’s available resources. Emotional exhaustion is theorized to occur first, followed by cynicism as people attempt to cope with their situation, and results in a decrease of personal accomplishment as they are unable to manage their situation effectively. Research on burnout as an outcome of people being ‘unwell’ has been credited by some
(Schaufeli et al., 2008) as leading into an interest in topics focused on well-being, such as engagement.

**Engagement**

Opposite to individuals who experience burnout, individuals who are engaged at work experience an active connection to their colleagues and work tasks that leads to feelings of personal accomplishment (Rana et al., 2014). Engagement has a relatively brief history in the literature, with much of the research so far focusing on its connection to burnout and employee well-being (Rich et al., 2010). It has gained understandable popularity in the research as it has been claimed to predict increased employee success and organizational financial performance (Rana et al., 2014). These benefits have pushed towards a more comprehensive understanding of employee engagement, in addition to literature that suggests that disengaged employees outweigh engaged employees and can be a detriment to organizational outcomes. In the early 1990s, Kahn (1990) described the importance of engagement from a motivational perspective, and that employees who were fully engaged were able to give their ‘full self’ to their work roles, including physical, cognitive and emotional energy. Not only does this conceptualization represent linkages to job performance, but it also offers a more comprehensive explanation for factors involved in an employee having positive outcomes. Some of the early research on engagement had a narrow focus on the performance outcomes of engagement, focusing on cognitive, affective or physical motivation but not taking into account a person’s ability to choose whether they invest these resources in their job (Kahn, 1990). Additionally, a person can choose which of these resources they choose to invest, or the possibility of investing them simultaneously, which would result in a more complete form of engagement from the individual. Engagement can therefore be understood as the investment of an individual’s full self into a role,
such as work, (Rich et al., 2010) and has been defined as “the simultaneous employment and expression of a person’s ‘preferred self’ in task behaviors that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence (physical, cognitive, and emotional) and active, full performances” (Kahn, pg. 700., 1990) and more recently by Albrecht (2010) as a “positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption” (p. 74). Vigor relates to high levels of energy while at work, dedication to being strongly involved in work tasks, and absorption as being fully concentrated and engrossed at work where there is difficulty detaching from it (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). When individuals are engaged, they are utilizing their full energy towards these physical, cognitive and emotional tasks in a way that satisfies their work role expectations completely.

This understanding of engagement is based on the idea that people allocate their own resources towards their work role performance and have the choice in how intensely and persistently they choose to continue investing these resources (Kanfer, 1990). Engagement goes beyond other concepts that involve physical or cognitive effort towards tasks because of the depth of involvement required to maintain this simultaneous effort in an integrated manner. A fragmented effort of cognitive, physical or emotional effort would not result in the same outcome as an individual using these resources in a connected manner towards a common goal or effort. This results in a multidimensional motivational concept that reflects the various dimensions that impact the overarching construct of job engagement (Kahn, 1992; Law et al., 1998). When individuals are engaged, organizations describe them as fully attentive towards job tasks, psychologically present, connected, integrated in organizational culture and focused towards role performances (Rich et al., 2010). It is worth noting that the observable output of engagement is the behavioral investment of physical, cognitive and affective energy in work roles and they
exhibit these behaviors when all aspects are accounted for; physically involved, cognitively attentive, and emotionally connected.

Although there are a multitude of factors that can impact an individual's level of engagement at work, Khan (1990) theorized that a combination of a person’s perceptions of their work environment and their individual characteristics serve as a direct influence for their resulting level of motivation or willingness to engage in work roles. He also suggested that there are three direct psychological conditions which proceed an individual choosing to engage at work, including; meaningfulness, psychological safety, and psychological availability. The characteristics of both the individual and organization serve as a foundation that direct the responses to these conditions. Antecedents of engagement have been described as value congruence, perceived organizational support, and core self-evaluations, (Rich et al., 2010), but are most commonly described by job and personal resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). Job resources can be aspects of an individual’s job such as social support from either colleagues or supervisors, autonomy, task variety and opportunities for growth and development. These are the social, physical or organizational aspects of a person’s job that can help in reducing job demands, achieve work goals, and stimulate personal growth or achievement. In terms of engagement, job resources play a necessary role in intrinsic and extrinsic motivation towards achieving goals and fill a person’s basic needs that allow them to focus on higher-order goals. Personal resources follow this same line of thinking, with characteristics such as self-efficacy, self-esteem and optimism being shown as predictors of engagement.

In addition to predictors of engagement, moderators such as individual characteristics give us valuable insight into contributing factors impacting outcomes (Rana et al., 2014). Individuals in the same organization, experiencing the same organizational culture, supervisor
support and organizational resources, may have differing responses to whether they engage or disengage in some or all of their task performances. Individuals have assumptions of their work environment, and differences such as proactive personality, achievement orientation, self-efficacy and conscientiousness could positively impact higher levels of engagement (Fleck & Inceoglue, 2010). Along this same thought pattern, Bakker and Demerouti (2008) suggested that individuals who are engaged possess personal resources like self-esteem, resilience and optimism that allow them to positively impact the environment around them.

Literature suggests employees that are engaged give organizations a competitive advantage and have higher levels of productivity (Rana et al., 2014). Some of the most common outcomes of engagement discussed are job performance, turnover intention and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) (Fleck & Inceoglu, 2010; Khan, 1990; Schaufeli et al., 2002). Engaged employees have shown to outperform their disengaged counterparts, often reporting higher levels of satisfaction, commitment, productivity. This aligns with OCBs as well, as employees who feel committed and invested in their work role are more likely to exhibit extra-role behaviors that are beneficial to their organization. Both of these outcomes result from employees feeling content in their role, which naturally results in decreased turnover intention (Soane et al., 2012). Engaged employees are able to use these personal resources to then exercise influence over other areas of their lives. Because of their activity and attitude towards their work, they can create their own positive feedback by way of appreciation, success and recognition they receive as a result of their effort towards their work role (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008).

Regardless of the predictor, or outcome of engagement, there are often a complex set of factors and dynamics at play that lead an employee to being engaged in their work role.
**Theory**

Understanding the mechanisms of engagement can be assisted by drawing on assumptions of the job-demands resources model (JD-R), which is explained in depth in the following job crafting literature review section. Bakker and Demerouti (2008) describe two assumptions as explaining their model of work engagement. The first, is that resources like performance feedback, autonomy, and social support from colleagues and supervisors begin a process of motivation that often leads to work engagement and result in increased job performance. The second is that resources become increasingly necessary and gain momentum when confronted with increased job demands such as emotional and mental demands, and heavy workload. These assumptions in combination with personal resources or individual characteristics that lend themselves towards behavior and attitudes that promote engagement allow individuals to mobilize resources in a manner that often leads them to be more engaged at work. Using JD-R as a means to explain work engagement follows the theory that job and personal resources either in silo or combined predict work engagement and have a particularly impactful effect when an individual’s job demands are high. Individuals with high levels of work engagement in turn have higher job performance, which then allows them to create more resources and sustain a positive gain spiral.

**Job Crafting**

The construct of job crafting was originally coined by Wrzesnieski and Dutton (2001) but had actually shown up in the literature almost 20 years prior by Kulik et al (1987). Originally, it was emphasized that people engage in job crafting on their own accord, without the involvement from others. Job crafting can be defined as a “self-initiated change behavior that employees engage in with the aim to align their jobs with their own preferences, motives, and passions'
This behavior can take several different forms or a combination depending on the degree of alignment a person is looking for. The first way a person can attempt to change their behavior is task related, either by changing the number of tasks they have or the type of tasks (Tims et al., 2012). The second way is when people change the relationships they have with their colleagues. For example, they may begin to reduce the frequency or intensity of contact they have with others while at work. Lastly, involves when people change the cognitions, they have regarding their job in attempts to improve their satisfaction or meaning with their work. Recent research has expanded on this original definition by claiming job crafting can have additional forms such as self-development (Lyons, 2008), or cutting tasks that could be viewed as detrimental to their mental or physical well-being (Grant et al., 2010). The literature does support the notion that job crafting can indeed include cutting or removing tasks but acknowledges that this is less valued by organizations and is likely underreported by employees when asked whether they engage in these behaviors. Rather than conceptualizing job crafting as redesigning one’s work, it is more about altering specific job tasks within the job duties and expectations. Sometimes these alterations result in significant shifts, such as an employee creating more autonomy in their work which leads to a greater sense of ownership and responsibility for their work and subsequently leads to increased effort towards these tasks. Alternatively, smaller or short-term changes can also positively impact a person’s work environment, such as asking for help or delegating tasks if able to do so.

What distinguishes job crafting from other related job redesign initiatives is that it is initiated and carried out by the employee, rather than involving a manager, for example, who would need to agree to the alterations in job duties (Tims et al., 2012). Job crafting does, however, overlap with constructs such as proactivity as both involve an employee taking control
and making changes to their job duties either currently or in advance. Proactivity constructs typically refer to behavior that goes beyond what is expected in the job and can have positive outcomes for both the employee and the organization such as organization effectiveness. These behaviors are typically found in people with a disposition towards proactivity, who are more likely to take initiative, and keep working on something until they reach their desired goal (Crant, 1995). Job crafting can be seen as a specific form of proactive work behavior and deviates from these other constructs because it is focused more on improving the person-environment fit with their organization and increasing their motivation through autonomous action. An integral aspect of job crafting is the employee’s perception of their work environment and how closely that aligns with their personal preferences, values and skills.

One question that has been raised in the literature is whether every employee is capable of job crafting (Tims et al., 2012). If we consider that job crafting falls under the umbrella of proactive behavior, where people can have a natural disposition towards proactively crafting their job duties, it is understandable that some may engage in job crafting more effortlessly. Tims and colleagues (2012) argue that even though some may have an easier time with this, everyone is capable of job crafting, although note that an employee's level of autonomy within their job is an aspect that will affect their ability to do so. Wrzesniewski & Dutton (2001) found evidence, however, that even though employees may have reduced autonomy in their positions they are still able to craft with nurses who were able to change their relational boundaries with patient’s family members regarding input and information which reduced time demands and increased resources. Berg et al (2010) found similar results but expanded on this by finding that even though employees in various types of positions were able to job craft, employees in lower ranking jobs experienced different challenges than those in higher ranking positions. This might
look like having to shift other’s thinking and behaviors to be able to take advantage of crafting. Many of these dynamics can be understood better by exploring the theoretical backings used to explain job crafting.

**Theory**

Job crafting literature has often explained itself using the job-demands resources (JD-R) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). At the center of this model is the assumption that despite the occupation or industry, every employee will experience a combination of job demands and job resources, even though the specifics of these may vary by job and organization. In this light, it is understood that employees attempt to balance both their job demands and job resources with their needs and abilities (Tims & Bakker, 2010). According to JD-R, there are two main categories of job characteristics: job demands and job resources. Job demands are any aspect of the job that require sustained psychological or physical energy or skills and are typically viewed as a cost to the individual. In this context, job demands could be a heavy client caseload, or emotionally demanding interactions with clients, colleagues or supervisors. Job resources are integral in achieving work goals and reducing the demands and accompanying psychological and physical costs of a job. These resources can be targeted towards growth, learning, development and assist in either reducing or mitigating the cost that comes with job demands. Example resources can include autonomy or positive feedback from a colleague or supervisor. Viewing job crafting through the lens of JD-R allows us to more fully capture the nuances and characteristics that employees alter as they try to improve their work environment. An example of this is a therapist who encounters frequent emotionally demanding interactions with clients (job demands) but builds necessary therapeutic interventions and skills (job resources) which
allows them to effectively deal with these demands in a way that does not cost them an excess of resources.

Within the framework of JD-R, job crafting can be understood as having three distinct dimensions (Tims et al., 2012). The first is focused on increasing job resources, with the notion that gained or stored resources would be able to buffer detrimental effects caused by job demands. The second relates to increasing challenging job demands if a job is not stimulating enough. This would allow an employee to address feeling bored or not challenged in their role in attempts to avoid outcomes such as absenteeism or decreased job satisfaction. Being able to craft more challenging demands would allow an employee to increase personal growth while feeling more engaged in their job duties. The third relates to decreasing hindering job demands if they perceive an aspect of their job has become overwhelming. When employees are exposed to high job demands with low job resources, they can experience outcomes such as burnout or impairments in mental or physical health (Bakker et al., 2005). These three scenarios give some explanation for how feeling imbalanced imbalance can be conceptualized as a demand, and how job resources can trigger a motivation to attempt crafting elements of their job to better fit their preferences and skills.

**Job Demands**

Interest in job demands as a function of an individual’s well-being or experience at work continues to grow, as the literature fine tunes how different demands impact people and occupations in various ways. Job demands can be understood as a characteristic of an individual’s job, with intended and unintended consequences, that is a burden to their capacity to perform the role (Van den Broeck et al., 2010). They often come at a cost to the individual, either physiologically or psychologically, resulting in possible exhaustion or cynicism (Bakker &
Demerouti, 2007). Job demands can encompass a variety of characteristics, including; workload, task interruptions, and work-home interference. When individuals are initially confronted with demands, they often try to cope with them by using additional resources or energy but prolonged exposure to demands that continue to use an excess of resources typically has detrimental effects (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). There is a growing understanding in the literature that some job demands have exclusively negative consequences, and others have a mix of both negative and positive consequences (Podsakoff et al., 2007). Additionally, some studies have found evidence that factors such as autonomy, social support and feedback are able to buffer the negative effects of job demands on well-being outcomes (Bakker et al., 2005).

Job demands can be conceptualized as challenge demands and hindrance demands, depending on the outcome of the demand on the individual’s work role. Challenge demands, those that are attainable but require time and effort such as task complexity, responsibilities and time pressure, or hindrance demands, those that prevent or impede individuals from completing tasks such as role ambiguity, or organizational politics (Liu et al., 2022). Challenge demands have shown both positive (engagement, satisfaction and performance) outcomes as well as negative outcomes such as job strain. These demands can be conceptualized as whether they are time-based, such as the number of overall hours worked, strain-based, such as the parts of the job that cause strain for the individual (Gu, et al., 2020). Because job demands require a sustained form of energy, either physical or mental, they result in a loss or lessening of resources to the individual. Within the work-family context, this may mean the individual has less resources to give or use in the family domain.

Much of the previous literature on job demands has relied on a list of similar demands, based on assumptions of example occupations and can be limiting when used in relation to work
roles with unique or specific job demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Despite evidence suggesting that assessment of job demands should include occupation specific job demands in addition to more general ones, most literature continues to cite generic demands in their studies (Brough & Briggs, 2015). Aiello and Tesi (2021) describe how those working in helping professions are especially exposed to emotional job demands and that the prolonged exposure of these can have detrimental effects depending on several factors. Heckenberg et al. (2018) conducted a qualitative study of direct care workers to determine their job demands and resources and found that six themes emerged relating to demands, including; funding insecurity, hindrance demands, time pressure, poor systems, emotional engagement and client crises. Direct care workers, including mental health therapists often experience specific workplace demands such as heavy client loads, feeling rushed, or balancing administrative tasks with client care. In addition to these demands, mental health is largely subject to funding changes in terms of reimbursement rates and government policy which can add stress on top of everyday demands. Faced with continuous job demands with insufficient job resources, individuals may begin to struggle to manage the emotional labor of engaging in these demands and attempt to cope using surface or deep acting (Gu et al., 2020). As other reviews of the literature have also detailed, the individual differences or individual perceptions of job demands also creates variability on their outcomes (Brough & Briggs, 2015). Whereas some individuals may be better adept at psychologically detaching from their job demands, others may struggle to do so which can impair their ability to recover from them during non-work time.

Outcomes of job demands are often determined not only by the effect of the demand, but also the amount of job control a person has, as both play a role in the stressor-strain relationship (Karasek, 1979).
Theory

The job demands literature uses JD-R as the primary theoretical framework, as detailed above in the job crafting literature review, but its specific relation to the constructs in this study will be further explained. As Van den Broech et al. (2010) discusses, the JD-R model differentiates job demands based on the occupation. Individuals experience job hindrances when they are faced with demands that appear threatening, they can feel a lack of control and begin attempting to cope with an emotion-focused coping style, responding with negative emotions that may interfere with their ability to achieve goals and maintain well-being. Job challenges, however, still require emotional energy, but also have the ability to be stimulating. Rather than eliciting an emotion-focused coping response, they trigger a problem-focused coping style which has the capacity to contribute to an individual’s personal achievement. These types of demands have the ability to contribute to negative health outcomes as well as well-being. JD-R assumes that negative outcomes occur either when there is an excess of job demands or a lack of job resources (Gu et al., 2020).

Hypothesis Development

An increase in nonstandard and flexible work in combination with multiple forces impacting organizations have dramatically shifted the way individuals create and maintain boundaries between work and family (Kossek et al, 2022). Both boundary management, and JD-R help us to understand how individuals’ organizational segmentation norms can impact their work family enrichment, engagement, and potential burnout, and whether their own segmentation preferences, job demands and ability to job craft moderates those relationships (Ashforth et al, 2000). Employees who work at organizations with a norm for segmentation are able to stick to their expected work hours and minimize the negative impact work may have on
their family domain (Kubicek & Tement, 2016). If we consider an organization’s segmentation norms as “supplies,” it can act like a job resource to individual’s if they promote segmentation. Job resources help to reduce demands and allow people to be successful in meeting goals and accomplishments, in addition to being positively associated with engagement (Heckenberg et al., 2018). Because segmentation between these domains allows individuals to compartmentalize their roles in each, they are able to distance themselves from stressors at work and conserve resources to use in their family domain (Powell & Greenhaus, 2010). Pulling from theories of conservation of resources, boundary management and border theory in addition to the importance of work-life issues in the workplace, it makes sense that a person’s perception of their organizational segmentation environment will influence the way they decide to enact borders and use or store resources in their domains (Ashforth et al, 2000; Bulgar et al, 2007). Boundary theory specifically helps us to understand within the context of work and family roles that the strength and flexibility of these boundaries will influence the outcomes of the interaction between those domains, and whether that results in enrichment or not (Ashforth et al., 2000; Nipper-Eng, 1996; Kreiner et al., 2009). Due to mental health therapists having a people-centered work role, it is important to determine characteristics and norms of organizations that may be associated with increased stress or demands on individuals (Heckenberg et al., 2018).

Assumptions regarding role salience between genders (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) and individual differences between personal characteristics (Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012; Wayne et al., 2007) give us a foundation to theorize how an individual’s unique makeup will likely impact the amount of enrichment, engagement or burnout they experience as a result of the segmentation norms present in their organization. Additionally, research on how organization’s expectations or norms for individuals during non-work time can impact how they decide to
segment or integrate their domains helps explain why these norms are important for organizations to consider as they impact both organizational and employee outcomes (Van Laethem et al., 2018).

**Hypothesis 1:** Segmentation norms will be negatively related to burnout and positively related to engagement and enrichment.

Recent years have seen an increase in work intensification, with many employees exerting greater effort with less time to recover (Kubicek & Tement, 2016). A pervasive work culture of being ‘on the clock’ at all times in conjunction with blurred boundaries between work and home has pressured individuals to develop strategies to manage these demands and norms. Although studies have mentioned interest in linking boundary management with work-family enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), there is little comprehensive understanding regarding how individual boundary management strategies interact with organizational boundary supplies and what the outcomes of this on the work-family domains are (Liu et al., 2016). Previous research has suggested that organizational segmentation norms and individual segmentation behavior have similar effects and by creating boundaries between work and home will reduce the likelihood that negative experiences will spill over into other domains (Kubicek & Tement, 2016). Recent studies by Kinnunen et al. (2016) and Wepfer et al. (2018) also support the idea that segmenting work and family domains is often connected with better recovery from job demands. Although there are some studies that purport that segmentation between work and family may not have beneficial effects for everyone, recent research by Chan et al. (2022) looking deeper into this dynamic found that this was because some individuals are not able to fully detach from their work role, and attempts to segment between the two actually causes stress as a result of this. Despite the lack of research linking boundary management to work family
enrichment (Chen et al., 2009), it is reasonable to assume that a preference towards segmentation is a helpful strategy in preventing work family conflict and increasing work family enrichment. 

**Hypothesis 2:** Segmentation preferences will be negatively related to burnout and positively related to engagement and enrichment.

**Hypothesis 2a:** Segmentation preferences will increase the negative relationship between segmentation norms and burnout.

**Hypothesis 2b:** Segmentation preferences will increase the positive relationship between segmentation norms and engagement.

**Hypothesis 2c:** Segmentation preferences will increase the positive relationship between segmentation norms and enrichment.

For this study, we are specifying job demands as unexpected intrusions in normal work role expectations. These intrusions may be part of a mental health therapist’s job duties, but do not happen on a regular or expected frequency and can cause disruptions to their daily tasks and schedule. These demands are often hindrance demands, as they prevent them from doing expected work tasks and can be stressful in nature (Heckenberg et al., 2018). Challenge demands, in contrast, have shown both positive (engagement, satisfaction and performance) outcomes (Liu et al., 2022). Multiple studies (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Bakker et al., 2003; Demerouti et al., 2001) have connected various prolonged job demands with impaired health outcomes and predictive of burnout. When individuals are confronted with job demands initially, they attempt to cope by using additional resources, or stored resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). For mental health therapists, they might begin responding to an increase in hindrance demands by spending extra time on paperwork to ensure they are adhering to all licensure and ethical guidelines or take a training on crisis response. In the beginning, this may be helpful in
providing resources in the form of peace of mind when they are addressing client needs responsibly or feeling more confident in their ability to respond to crisis situations, but over time this is not sustainable. Added time and role-based demands have a cumulative depletion on individual resources, which can result in a loss spiral and lead to burnout (Maslach et al, 2001). Following this rationale for negative outcomes like burnout, individuals with a deficit of resources or resource loss would understandably have less resources to attribute towards either other domains to promote work family enrichment, or work roles that may promote engagement. Hobfoll (2002) and Greenhaus & Powell (2006) both argue that those who have a larger store of accumulated resources are able to more effectively cope with increased job demands and less likely to experience resource loss that may lead to burnout, or lower levels of work family enrichment or engagement. Karasek (1979) framed these dynamics by explaining how the outcomes of job demands are often determined not only by the effect the demand has on an individual, but also the amount of job control a person has. As organization’s segmentation norms impact the perception of control an individual has on their ability to segment and navigate collecting, using and increasing the resources within their work and family domains, it is understandable that these norms would affect how intensely job demands have on outcomes such as work family enrichment, burnout and engagement.

Hypothesis 3: Job demands will be positively related to burnout and negatively related to engagement and enrichment.

Hypothesis 3a: High job demands will increase the negative relationship between segmentation norms and burnout.

Hypothesis 3b: High job demands will decrease the positive relationship between segmentation norms and engagement.
Hypothesis 3c: High job demands will decrease the positive relationship between segmentation norms and enrichment. (High demands will interfere with the positive effects of segmentation norms.)

Although the focus often falls on the detrimental effects of high demands or organizations that promote integration, research on proactive measures individuals can take to better their work environment or increase available resources help to understand tools available to individuals to better their work domain (Wrzesnieski & Dutton, 2001). Using JR-R helps us to understand how job crafting is an attempt by employees to shape their job based on their preferences, skills and abilities (Tims et al., 2012). Usually this is conceptualized as a self-initiated activity, without the promotion or involvement from others (Grant et al, 2010). As job resources have the ability to buffer negative effects caused by job demands, job crafting may be able to contribute to engagement despite job demands being high (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), and also increase the relationship between segmentation norms and enrichment (Tims et al, 2012). An employee that puts devices on do not disturb during a scheduled working block or blocking out their schedule as busy every Friday to catch up on tasks may feel more in control of their job tasks and ability to complete their tasks during working hours. As organizational segmentation norms can feel in a way like a loss of control for an employee, an ability to feel more in control, i.e. by job crafting, can have positive outcomes on both their family and work domains. Within the proactivity constructs, job crafting is specifically related to an individual’s effort to improve their person-environment fit, which is highly aligned with segmentation norms and their proposed impact on individual outcomes (Crant, 1995). The literature on job crafting at this point reflects almost entirely theoretical or qualitative studies which has left some gaps in understanding and a need for more empirical studies (Tims et al., 2012).
Hypothesis 4: Job crafting will be negatively related to burnout and positively related to engagement and enrichment.

Hypothesis 4a: High levels of job crafting will decrease the negative relationship between segmentation norms and burnout.

Hypothesis 4b: High levels of job crafting will increase the positive relationship between segmentation norms and engagement.

Hypothesis 4c: High levels of job crafting will increase the positive relationship between segmentation norms and enrichment.
Samples

Sample 1 consisted of a total of 73 participants over the age of 18 who were recruited from a for-profit mental health agency in the State of Florida from a list of 427 employees provided for this research. As the original intent of the study was to collect longitudinal data, the collection was open for a period of 3 weeks, with surveys repeated once a week for a total of 3 surveys sent out. Due to the low response rate for participants over all 3 weeks, data was considered cross-sectional, and participants who completed the survey were only counted once in the final analysis. Any participant who completed the survey during this time was included in the data. Participants were eligible to complete the survey if they were working part or full time and consisted of mental health therapists and licensed mental health assessors with a hybrid or solely virtual work structure. These participants provide telehealth mental health treatment to client’s over the platform Zoom. The mental health therapists are required to work a minimum amount of client hours and have sole control over their weekly schedule, scheduling clients based on their preferred daily and weekly work schedule. The licensed therapists have control over their weekly and daily availability, but not over who is scheduled on a daily basis. Each position has different aspects of control regarding how they spend their work hours and what tasks they complete during that time. All participants were sent an email each week with a link and instructions to complete the survey measure online via Qualtrics. Data included identifying age, gender, and whether the participants meet the requirement of working full time. Of the 73 participants who completed the survey, 56% were therapists, 44% were licensed assessors, 14% male, 62% female, and less than 2% of participants identified as genderqueer, non-binary or gender fluid, or
requested not to disclose their gender. For ethnicity, 11% were Black, 41% Caucasian, and 26%
Hispanic or Latino. Not all surveys were completed by all participants, therefore pairwise
deletion was used for all analysis. Because of low response rates (17%), a second sample of
mental health professionals was recruited using Amazon’s mTurk.

Sample 2 consisted of a total of 80 participants out of 150 over the age of 18 who were
recruited using Amazon’s mTurk. Consistent with sample 1, the data collection period was open
for 3 weeks, and participants who completed a survey during this time period were only counted
once. Participants were pre-screened for eligibility by answering a question asking if they were
in a healthcare related job position and were working part or full time. Job titles ranged from
mental health counselors to case managers. Participants also completed attention checks as part
of the survey, being asked the number of years they had worked as a therapist, percentage of
time working virtually and their job title. Of the 80 participants who completed the survey, 31%
were male, and 66% were female. For ethnicity, 10% were Black, 74% were Caucasian, 6% were
Hispanic or Latino, and 6% were Asian. Measures can be found in Appendix A.

Analysis

The relationships for Hypothesis 1 were analyzed using correlations between the
variables. The proposed moderated relationships for Hypothesis 2 through 4 were tested with a
series of multiple regressions. A total of 36 analyses were conducted across samples 1 and 2,
examining each of the three moderators’ effect on the predicted relationship between
segmentation norms and the three outcome variables: work family enrichment, engagement, and
burnout.
**Measures**

For sample 2, several attention checks were inputted to flag participants who did not appear to be accurately completing the survey.

**Work-Family Segmentation.** The measure of work-family segmentation chosen for this study is the 8-item scale by Kreiner (2006). This scale utilizes a 7-point Likert scale with anchors from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) and 4 being (neutral). Individual level items were used to address individual segmentation preferences, and supply questions were included to address the segmentation norms of the organization, or the perceived organizational segmentation environment. An example of the preferences item includes “I don’t like to have to think about work when I’m at home” and an example of the organization's supply is “My workplace lets people forget about work when they’re at home.” A reliability analysis showed this measure reached an acceptable level, $= .93$.

**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, $\alpha = .94$.

**Burnout.** The measure for burnout chosen for this study is a 22-item scale by Maslach & Jackson (1981). This scale utilizes a 6-point Likert scale, with anchors ranging from 0 (Never) to 5 (Every day) for all three forms. Examples include, “I feel emotionally drained by my work” by the burnout section, “I feel I look after certain patients/clients impersonally, as if they are objects” for the depersonalization section, and “I feel refreshed when I have been close to my patients/clients at work.” A high score in the first two sections and a low score on the last section may indicate burnout. A reliability analysis showed this measure reached an acceptable level.

**Engagement.** The measure of engagement chosen for this study is an 18-item scale by Rich et al., (2010). This scale utilizes a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Examples include, “I exert my full effort to my job” from the physical section, “I feel positive about my job” from the emotional section, and “at work, I focus a great deal of attention on my job” from the cognitive section. A reliability analysis showed this measure reached an acceptable level, $\alpha = .95$.

**Job Demands.** The measure for job demands chosen for this study is a 5-item scale by Ng et al., (2008). This scale utilizes a 5-point Likert scale, with anchors from 1 (often not enough to keep me busy) to 5 (entirely too much for me to handle). This measure was adapted to match the time duration of the data collection. Examples include, “How heavy was your workload during the
last 3 months,” and “During a normal work week, how frequently do exceptions arise in your work?” This scale has items that reflect quantitative demands (workload) and qualitative demands (task difficulty). A reliability analysis showed this measure reached a semi-acceptable level, $\alpha = .65$.

**Job-Crafting.** The measure for job crafting chosen for this study is a 21-item scale by Tims et al. (2012). This scale was modified to exclude the ‘Decreasing job demands’ section as this was not relevant to this study. This scale utilizes a 5 point Likert scale, with anchors from 1 (never) to 5 (often) Examples include, “I try to develop myself professionally” from the increasing structural job resources section, “I organize my work in such a way to make sure that I do not have to concentrate for too long a period at once” from the decreasing hindering job demands section, “I ask whether my supervisor is satisfied with my work” from the increasing social job resources section, and “If there are new developments, I am one of the first to learn about them and try them out” from the increasing challenging job demands section. A reliability analysis showed this measure reached an acceptable level, ranging from $\alpha = .75-.82$. 
Chapter 4

Results

Sample 1

Correlations and descriptive statistics between all study variables can be found in Appendix B, Table B1.

Hypothesis 1 stated there would be a negative relationship between segmentation norms and burnout and a positive relationship between segmentation norms and engagement and enrichment. This hypothesis was tested by examining the correlations between these variables. In order to look at burnout on a more granular level, the analysis was conducted by separating burnout into its three subfactors of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal achievement, although for the purposes of this study only emotional exhaustion and depersonalization were analyzed. Work-family enrichment was also separated out, and analyzed from a bi-directional lens, with both work-to-family and family-to-work analysis conducted. This hypothesis was tested by examining the correlations between these variables. Hypothesis 1 was partially supported. Segmentation norms were negatively related to the emotional exhaustion ($r = -.52$, $p < .05$) and depersonalization ($r = -.37$, $p < .05$) aspects of burnout, but not the personal achievement ($r = .16$, $p > .05$) aspect. Additionally, segmentation norms were positively related to engagement ($r = .31$, $p < .05$) and the work-to-family direction ($r = .51$, $p < .05$) of work-family enrichment, but not to the family-to-work direction ($r = .24$, $p < .05$) of work-family enrichment.

Hypothesis 2 included a main effect hypothesis and several moderation hypotheses. The main effect hypothesis stated there would be a negative relationship between segmentation preferences and burnout and a positive relationship between segmentation preferences and engagement and enrichment. Segmentation preferences were positively related to emotional
exhaustion \( (r = .37, p < .05) \), depersonalization \( (r = .43, p < .05) \) and negatively related to work-to-family enrichment \( (r = -.28, p < .05) \), but not personal achievement \( (r = -.13, p > .05) \), engagement \( (r = -.19, p > .05) \) or family-to-work enrichment \( (r = .13, p > .05) \), partially supporting Hypothesis 2 (see Appendix B, Table B1). The negative relationship with work to family enrichment and positive relationship with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, although significant, were in the opposite direction as hypothesized. Hypothesis 2a stated segmentation preferences would increase the negative relationship between segmentation norms and burnout (supported for emotional exhaustion, but not depersonalization). A moderated regression found the interaction term did explain incremental variance above the main effects for emotional exhaustion \( (\text{interaction } b = -.339, p < .05) \), but not the other aspects of burnout, partially supporting hypothesis 2a. The resulting relationship is shown in Figure 1a. Hypothesis 2b stated segmentation preferences would increase the positive relationship between segmentation norms and engagement. A moderated regression found the interaction term did not explain incremental variance above the main effects \( (\text{interaction } b = .076, p < .05) \), failing to support hypothesis 2b. Hypothesis 2c stated segmentation preferences would increase the positive relationship between segmentation norms and enrichment; this was supported for work-to-family enrichment, but not family-to-work enrichment. A moderated regression found the interaction term was significant for work-to-family enrichment \( (\text{interaction } b = .236, p < .05) \), partially supporting hypothesis 2c. The resulting relationship is shown in Figure 1b. Overall, hypothesis 2 was only partially supported, and full regression results can be found in Table 1.
Table 1

*Moderated Regression Results for Segmentation Preferences and Segmentation Norms for Sample 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Ordered Predictors</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>Segmentation Preferences (A)</td>
<td>1.21**</td>
<td>.392*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>-.339*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>Segmentation Preferences (A)</td>
<td>.848*</td>
<td>.275*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Segmentation Preferences (A)</td>
<td>-.297</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work - Family Enrichment</td>
<td>Segmentation Preferences (A)</td>
<td>-.813**</td>
<td>.334*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>-.580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>.236*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family - Work Enrichment</td>
<td>Segmentation Preferences (A)</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sample size varied from 58 to 66.
Hypothesis 3 included a main effect hypothesis and several moderation hypotheses. The main effect hypothesis stated there would be a positive relationship between job demands and burnout and a negative relationship between job demands and engagement and enrichment. Demands were positively related to emotional exhaustion ($r = .60, p < .05$), depersonalization ($r = .59, p < .05$) and work-to-family enrichment ($r = -.50, p < .05$), and negatively related to personal achievement ($r = -.32, p < .05$) and engagement ($r = -.56, p < .05$), but not family to work enrichment ($r = .03, p > .05$), partially supporting Hypothesis 3 (see Appendix B, Table B1). Although significant, the positive relationship with work to family enrichment was in the opposite direction as hypothesized. Hypothesis 3a stated high job demands would increase the negative relationship between segmentation norms and burnout. A moderated regression found the interaction term did not explain incremental variance above the main effects for emotional exhaustion (interaction $b = -.231, p < .05$) or depersonalization (interaction $b = -.184, p < .05$), failing to support hypothesis 3a. Hypothesis 3b stated high job demands would decrease the positive relationship between segmentation norms and engagement. A moderated regression
found the interaction term did not explain incremental variance above the main effects (interaction $b = .082$, $p < .05$), failing to support hypothesis 3b. Hypothesis 3c stated high job demands would decrease the positive relationship between segmentation norms and enrichment, such that high demands would interfere with the positive effects of segmentation norms. (significant for work to family enrichment, but not family to work enrichment). A moderated regression found the interaction term did explain incremental variance above the main effects for work to family enrichment (interaction $b = .419$, $p < .01$), although this was in the opposite direction as hypothesized, thus failing to support hypothesis 3c. The resulting relationship is shown in Figure 3. Overall, Hypothesis 3 was only partially supported, and full results can be found in Table 2.

Table 2

*Moderated Regression Results for Job Crafting and Segmentation Norms for Sample 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Ordered Predictors</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Demands (A)</td>
<td>1.1**</td>
<td>0.462*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>-0.231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Demands (A)</td>
<td>.959**</td>
<td>0.367*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Demands (A)</td>
<td>-0.643*</td>
<td>0.286*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 4 included a main effect hypothesis and several moderation hypotheses. The main effect hypothesis stated there would be a negative relationship between job crafting and burnout and a positive relationship between job crafting and engagement and enrichment. Job crafting was positively related to work to family enrichment ($r = .38$, $p < .05$), family to work
enrichment \((r = .31, p < .05)\), personal achievement \((r = .38, p < .05)\), and engagement \((r = .46, p < .05)\), and negatively related to depersonalization \((r = .38, p < .05)\), but not emotional exhaustion \((r = -.25, p < .05)\), partially supporting Hypothesis 4 (see Appendix B, Table B1). Although significant, the positive relationship with personal achievement was in the opposite direction as hypothesized. Hypothesis 4a stated high levels of job crafting would decrease the negative relationship between segmentation norms and burnout. A moderated regression found the interaction term did not explain incremental variance above the main effects for emotional exhaustion (interaction \(b = -.188, p < .05\)) or depersonalization \((b = -.017, p < .05)\), failing to support hypothesis 4a. Hypothesis 4b stated high levels of job crafting would increase the positive relationship between segmentation norms and engagement. A moderated regression found the interaction term did not explain incremental variance above the main effects (interaction \(b = .029, p < .05\), failing to support hypothesis 4b. Hypothesis 4c stated high levels of job crafting would increase the positive relationship between segmentation norms and enrichment. A moderated regression found the interaction term did not explain incremental variance above the main effects for work to family enrichment (interaction \(b = .216, p < .05\)) or family to work enrichment \((b = .034, p < .05)\), failing to support hypothesis 4c. Hypothesis 4 was not supported, and full results can be found in Table 3.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Ordered Predictors</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>Job Crafting (A)</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 1 stated there would be a negative relationship between segmentation norms and burnout and a positive relationship between segmentation norms and engagement and enrichment. This hypothesis was tested by examining the correlations between these variables. In order to look at burnout on a more granular level, the analysis was conducted by separating...
burnout into its three subfactors of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal achievement, although for the purposes of this study only emotional exhaustion and depersonalization were analyzed. Work-family enrichment was also separated out, and analyzed from a bi-directional lens, with both work-to-family and family-to-work analysis conducted. This hypothesis was tested by examining the correlations between these variables. Hypothesis 1 was partially supported. Segmentation norms were not related to the emotional exhaustion ($r = -.00$, $p < .05$), depersonalization ($r = .17$, $p < .05$), and personal achievement ($r = .07$, $p > .05$) aspects of burnout. Segmentation norms were positively related to engagement ($r = .25$, $p < .05$) and the work-to-family direction ($r = .27$, $p < .05$) of work-family enrichment, but not the family-to-work direction ($r = .12$, $p > .05$) of work-family enrichment.

Hypothesis 2 included a main effect hypothesis and several moderation hypotheses. The main effect hypothesis stated there would be a negative relationship between segmentation preferences and burnout and a positive relationship between segmentation preferences and engagement and enrichment. Segmentation preferences were positively related to engagement ($r = .46$, $p < .05$), family to work enrichment ($r = .29$, $p < .05$), and personal achievement ($r = -.29$, $p < .05$), but not emotional exhaustion ($r = .10$, $p < .05$), depersonalization ($r = .03$, $p < .05$) or work to family enrichment ($r = .19$, $p > .05$), partially supporting Hypothesis 2 (see Appendix B, Table B2). The positive relationship with personal achievement, although significant, was in the opposite direction as hypothesized. Hypothesis 2a stated segmentation preferences would increase the negative relationship between segmentation norms and burnout. A moderated regression found the interaction term did not explain incremental variance above the main effects for emotional exhaustion or depersonalization, failing to support hypothesis 2a. Hypothesis 2b stated segmentation preferences would increase the positive relationship between segmentation
norms and engagement. A moderated regression found the interaction term did explain incremental variance above the main effects (interaction $b = -.135$, $p < .05$), although this was in the opposite direction as hypothesized and therefore failed to support hypothesis 2b. The resulting relationship is shown in Figure 3. Hypothesis 2c stated segmentation preferences would increase the positive relationship between segmentation norms and enrichment. A moderated regression found the interaction term did not explain incremental variance above the main effects for work to family enrichment or family to work enrichment, failing to support hypothesis 2c. Overall, hypothesis 2 was only partially supported, and full regression results can be found in

Table 4.

Table 4

*Moderated Regression Results for Segmentation Preferences and Segmentation Norms for Sample 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Ordered Predictors</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation Preferences (A)</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation Preferences (A)</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation Preferences (A)</td>
<td>.688***</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>.616*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>-.135*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation Preferences (A)</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.059*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Work - Family Enrichment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation Preferences (A)</td>
<td>.537*</td>
<td>.071*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Family - Work Enrichment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Sample size ranged from 76-80

**Figure 3**

*Segmentation Preferences effect on the relationship between Engagement and Segmentation Norms for Sample 2*

Hypothesis 3 included a main effect hypothesis and several moderation hypotheses. The main effect hypothesis stated there would be a positive relationship between job demands and burnout and a negative relationship between job demands and engagement and enrichment.
Demands were positively related to emotional exhaustion \( (r = .70, p < .05) \), depersonalization \( (r = .60, p < .05) \), and work-to-family enrichment \( (r = .24, p < .05) \), but not personal achievement \( (r = .08, p < .05) \), engagement \( (r = .11, p < .05) \) or family-to-work enrichment \( (r = .09, p > .05) \), partially supporting Hypothesis 3 (see Appendix B, Table B2). Although significant, the positive relationship with work to family enrichment was in the opposite direction as hypothesized.

Hypothesis 3a stated high job demands would increase the negative relationship between segmentation norms and burnout. A moderated regression found the interaction term did not explain incremental variance above the main effects for emotional exhaustion \( (interaction \ b = - .017, p < .05) \) or depersonalization \( (interaction \ b = .202, p < .05) \), failing to support hypothesis 3a. Hypothesis 3b stated high job demands would decrease the positive relationship between segmentation norms and engagement. A moderated regression found the interaction term did explain incremental variance above the main effects \( (interaction \ b = -.27, p < .05) \), supporting hypothesis 3b. The resulting relationship is shown in Figure 4. Hypothesis 3c stated high job demands would decrease the positive relationship between segmentation norms and enrichment, such that high demands would interfere with the positive effects of segmentation norms. (supported for both work to family enrichment and family to work enrichment). A moderated regression found the interaction term did explain incremental variance above the main effects for work to family enrichment \( (interaction \ b = -.193, p < .05) \) and family to work enrichment \( (interaction \ b = -.239, p < .05) \), supporting hypothesis 3c. The resulting relationship is shown in Figure 5. Overall, Hypothesis 3 was only partially supported, and full results can be found in Table 5.
Table 5
Moderated Regression Results for Job Demands and Segmentation Norms for Sample 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Ordered Predictors</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Demands (A)</td>
<td>1.169*</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Demands (A)</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>-.419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Demands (A)</td>
<td>1.08**</td>
<td>.138**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>1.01**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Demands (A)</td>
<td>.922*</td>
<td>.141**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Family Enrichment</td>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>.790*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>-.193*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Demands (A)</td>
<td>.961*</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-Work Enrichment</td>
<td>Segmentation Norms (B)</td>
<td>.837*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>-.239*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sample size ranged from 75 to 78.
Hypothesis 4 included a main effect hypothesis and several moderation hypotheses. The main effect hypothesis stated there would be a negative relationship between job crafting and burnout and a positive relationship between job crafting and engagement and enrichment. Job crafting was positively related to work to family enrichment ($r = .52, p < .05$), family to work enrichment, and segmentation norms for Sample 2.
enrichment ($r = .59, p < .05$), personal achievement ($r = .59, p < .05$), and engagement ($r = .66, p < .05$), but not emotional exhaustion ($r = .19, p < .05$) or depersonalization ($r = .21, p < .05$), partially supporting Hypothesis 4 (see Appendix B, Table B1). Although significant, the positive relationship with personal achievement was in the opposite direction as hypothesized.

Hypothesis 4a stated high levels of job crafting would decrease the negative relationship between segmentation norms and burnout. A moderated regression found the interaction term did explain incremental variance above the main effects for depersonalization ($interaction b = .424, p < .05$), but not emotional exhaustion ($interaction b = .262, p < .05$), partially supporting hypothesis 4a.

The resulting relationship is shown in Figure 6. Hypothesis 4b stated high levels of job crafting would increase the positive relationship between segmentation norms and engagement. A moderated regression found the interaction term did explain incremental variance above the main effects ($interaction b = -.27, p < .05$), although in the opposite direction as hypothesized, failing to support hypothesis 4b. The resulting relationship is shown in Figure 7. Hypothesis 4c stated high levels of job crafting would increase the positive relationship between segmentation norms and enrichment. A moderated regression found the interaction term did explain incremental variance above the main effects for family to work enrichment ($b = -.19, p < .05$), although not in the hypothesized direction, but not work to family enrichment ($interaction b = -.095, p < .05$), failing to support hypothesis 4c. The resulting relationship is shown in Figure 8. Hypothesis 4 was partially supported, and full results can be found in Table 6.

**Table 6**

*Moderated Regression Results for Job Crafting and Segmentation Norms for Sample 2*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Crafting (A)</th>
<th>Segmentation Norms (B)</th>
<th>AxB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Exhaustion</strong></td>
<td>- .468</td>
<td>- .997</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depersonalization</strong></td>
<td>- .914</td>
<td>-1.37*</td>
<td>.424*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong></td>
<td>1.188***</td>
<td>.856***</td>
<td>-.202**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work - Family Enrichment</strong></td>
<td>.757**</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>-.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family - Work Enrichment</strong></td>
<td>1.177***</td>
<td>.735*</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sample size ranged from 75-78.
Figure 6

*Job Crafting effect on the relationship between Depersonalization and Segmentation Norms for Sample 2*

![Graph showing the relationship between Depersonalization and Segmentation Norms for Sample 2. The graph includes lines for different job crafting levels.]

Figure 7

*Job Crafting effect on the relationship between Engagement and Segmentation Norms for Sample 2*

![Graph showing the relationship between Engagement and Segmentation Norms for Sample 2. The graph includes lines for different job crafting levels.]

**Figure 8**

*Job Crafting effect on the relationship between Family to Work Enrichment and Segmentation Norms for Sample 2*

![Predicted Values of Family to Work Enrichment](image)

**Table 7**

*Overall results of supported hypothesis for Sample 1 & 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Sample 1</th>
<th>Sample 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td><em>Partially Supported</em></td>
<td><em>Partially Supported</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td><em>Partially Supported</em></td>
<td><em>Partially Supported</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2a</td>
<td><em>Partially Supported</em></td>
<td><em>Not Supported</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2b</td>
<td><em>Not Supported</em></td>
<td><em>Not Supported</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2c</td>
<td><em>Partially Supported</em></td>
<td><em>Not Supported</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3</td>
<td><em>Partially Supported</em></td>
<td><em>Partially Supported</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3a</td>
<td><em>Not Supported</em></td>
<td><em>Not Supported</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3b</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3c</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4a</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4b</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4c</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample 1

Although there were hypotheses in the study with at least partial support, the only hypothesis that were fully supported were Hypothesis 3b for Job Demands and Hypothesis 3c for Job Crafting in Sample 2. For hypothesis 1, segmentation norms were negatively related to the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization aspects of burnout, and positively related to engagement and work to family enrichment. This means when an organization provides a norm for segmentation, employees are more likely to experience lower levels of burnout, be more engaged at work, and feel more enriched in their family domain.

In order to understand burnout on a more granular level, the analysis was conducted by separating burnout into its three subfactors of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal achievement to see the nuances these constructs have on different aspects of the burnout process. This provided some clarity, as segmentation norms were not related to the personal achievement aspect of burnout but were negatively related to employees feeling emotionally exhausted and experiencing depersonalization. Similarly, with work-family enrichment, looking at these from a more granular bi-directional nature showed a relationship between the work to family direction but not the family to work direction. This is understandable, as boundaries around work time would lead to an employee likely experiencing less intrusion in their family domain and result in enrichment.

For hypothesis 2, segmentation preferences were positively related to emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, and negatively related to work to family enrichment. These relationships, although significant, were in the opposite direction as hypothesized which may
mean when an individual has a preference for segmentation, they could experience stress as a result of needing to maintain boundaries between their domains and end up experiencing higher levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, and less work to family enrichment. The moderation analysis showed segmentation preferences increased the negative relationship with emotional exhaustion and also the positive relationship with work to family enrichment. This means when individuals have a preference for segmenting their boundaries, they are able to better protect themselves from burnout by possibly storing resources or using those resources to buffer the negative effects of burnout and reserve resources that could help them feel enriched at home.

For hypothesis 3, high job demands were positively related to two aspects of burnout; emotional exhaustion, and depersonalization, and work to family enrichment and negatively related to and personal achievement, engagement. Work to family enrichment and personal achievement were related in the opposite of the hypothesized directions, which could indicate that when people experience more demands at work that they are able to overcome, they end up feeling achievement at work and then carry over these positive resources to their home life. This means when individuals are experiencing higher job demands at work, they are more likely to also experience all aspects of burnout, being more emotionally worn out, detached, and feel lower levels of achievement in their tasks. The moderation analysis showed that when job demands were high, they actually increased the positive relationship between segmentation norms and work to family enrichment. Although this was not the hypothesized direction, it could indicate again that people feel a sense of achievement by managing their demands at work and were able to carry this over to their family.
Hypothesis 4 was positively related to job crafting and both directions of work family enrichment and engagement and negatively related to depersonalization. It was also positively related to personal achievement, although not in the hypothesized direction, which could indicate that people attempting to take control over their work environment may feel a sense of achievement at work. For the supported relationships, this makes sense that people who are proactively crafting their work environment to better suit them would in turn feel a sense of enrichment at home and in turn work, and also more committed to their work environment. These individuals may also be able to protect themselves from negative aspects of burnout by using resources creating from job crafting to buffer these affects. There was not support for job crafting as a moderator for sample 1.

Sample 2

All hypotheses in the study were at least partially supported in terms of the relationship and impact between variables. For hypothesis 1, segmentation norms were positively related to engagement and work to family enrichment. These results echoed the findings from sample 1, showing when an organization provides a norm for segmentation, employees are more likely to be engaged at work, and feel more enriched in their family domain as a result of the experiences they are having at work. The results of sample 2 deviated from sample 1 in terms of the relationship between segmentation norms and burnout, with these correlations not significant.

For hypothesis 2, segmentation preferences were positively related to family to work enrichment and engagement, and personal achievement. As personal achievement was significant in the opposite direction as hypothesized, this could mean that people who are able to clearly define the boundaries between their domains may also experience more aspects of personal achievement at work due to protection of their resources. This was opposite of sample 1 findings
in terms of enrichment which could show that individual preferences for segmentation has varying relatedness to their experience of enrichment and burnout. In addition to this, the moderation analysis showed segmentation preferences impacted engagement, but opposite of what was hypothesized. This could mean when individuals have a preference for segmentation of their boundaries, they are more protective of their resources and use these less towards and use these less towards becoming engaged at work.

For hypothesis 3, high job demands were positively related to the depersonalization and emotional exhaustion aspects of burnout and work to family enrichment, although the relationship with work to family enrichment was not related in the hypothesized direction. This means when individuals are experiencing higher job demands at work, they are more likely to also experience more emotional depletion and detachment, and could possibly experience enrichment in their family domain as a result of their experience overcoming these demands at work. Additionally, the moderation analysis showed that when job demands were high, they decreased the positive relationship between segmentation norms and work to family enrichment, family to work enrichment and engagement. This makes sense as individuals attempting to manage higher demands at work and have less resources to bring to their family or contribute to work despite their organization’s segmentation norms. In turn, since this relationship was also supported from a family to work direction, this could indicate a cyclical dynamic where employees feeling less enriched as a result of demands at work, and in turn have less resources in their family domain to contribute to their work domain.

For hypothesis 4, job crafting was positively related to both directions of enrichment, engagement and also personal achievement, although personal achievement was not in the hypothesized direction. Similarly to sample 1, this could indicate that people attempting to take
control over their work environment may feel a sense of achievement at work. For the supported relationships, this makes sense that people who are proactively crafting their work environment to better suit them would in turn feel a sense of enrichment at home and in turn work, and also more committed to their work environment. The moderation analysis showed that when individuals participate in job crafting, they decrease the negative relationship between depersonalization and segmentation norms. This makes sense, as individuals proactively putting effort towards their work domain would be better able to use the resources gained from these efforts to protect or decrease any negative impacts of burnout such as feeling detached from their work environment. For engagement and the family to work direction, even though these relationships were significant, they were not in the hypothesized direction. This could indicate that efforts towards job crafting might actually be costing people resources, which could leave them at a deficit and feeling less committed at work, or more depleted with less resources to contribute to their work domain.

**Summary of Moderated Regressions**

In total, 36 moderated regressions were run in samples 1 and 2 examining three moderators (segmentation preferences, job demands, and job crafting) of the relationship between segmentation norms and multiple outcomes (burnout, work-family enrichment, engagement). Across both studies, only 10 of the 30 interaction terms were significant, and of these only 5 were supported in the hypothesized direction. None of the interactions ended up being supported for both samples 1 and 2. This indicates that there is a high degree of variability in these interactions, both in terms of individuals and the roles and organizations they come from. It would be helpful to gain a better understanding of when there are interactions between these variables, and what is influencing these differences.
General Discussion

In general, these results show support for organizational segmentation norms being beneficial for employee and organizational outcomes. Regardless of whether these norms are formal or informal, they set an expectation for employees to follow (Yang et al., 2019) and have impacts on employees’ roles outside of work (Bulgar et al, 2007). This is in line with research that supports the idea that when employees are able to stick to their expected work hours, the negative impact work may have on their family domain is limited (Kubicek & Tement, 2016). By considering an organization’s segmentation norms as a resource for employees, they can aid in reducing demands, buffer negative experiences and increase engagement (Heckenberg et al., 2018). Because segmentation between these domains allows individuals to compartmentalize their roles in each, they are able to distance themselves from stressors at work and conserve resources to use in their family domain (Powell & Greenhaus, 2010). Pulling from theories of conservation of resources, boundary management and border theory in addition to the importance of work-life issues in the workplace, it makes sense that a person’s perception of their organizational segmentation environment will influence the way they decide to enact borders and use or store resources in their domains (Ashforth et al, 2000, Bulgar et al, 2007). Boundary theory specifically helps us to understand within the context of work and family roles that the strength and flexibility of these boundaries will influence the outcomes of the interaction between those domains, and whether that results in enrichment or not (Ashforth et al., 2000; Nipper-Eng, 1996; Kreiner et al., 2009).

Similarly to organizational segmentation norms being beneficial for employee outcomes, individual’s segmentation preferences were also shown to positively support well-being and work-family dynamics. This echoes research by Chen et al (2008) that found when people’s
segmentation preferences were aligned with their organization, they experienced a positive spillover of resources from work to family domains. Greenhaus & Powell (2006) explains how resources gained in one role can have a direct effect on performance in the other role, helping our understanding of how an organization’s environment can influence an individual’s segmentation preferences and resulting positive or negative outcomes. As segmentation norms and preferences are conceptualized as a continuum, the greater the organization norms and individual’s preferences, the higher the impact on buffering negative effects of emotional exhaustion and their family domains maintaining their existing resources (Allen et al, 2014).

Job demands add necessary clarity to these dynamics, as higher levels of demands have greater impacts on well-being, work-family dynamics and engagement. Derks et al. (2015) explains how high job demands can make it difficult for people to disengage from work, leading to exhaustion from sustained attention on the demands. They also are more likely to feel less engaged at work and less enrichment in their family domain. Also helpful in understanding these relationships is work by Ammons (2013) underlying the importance of recognizing how people’s subjective interpretation of demands will also have an impact on their outcomes.

Job crafting as a moderator was intended to capture how an individual’s proactive attempt to better or improve their work environment improved well-being and experiences at work. Although there was not support for this with Sample 1, Sample 2 individuals reported an impact on these outcome variables as a result of job crafting. When individuals use proactive behaviors such as job crafting to solve increased job demands, or perceived or actual threats or depletion to resources, they are able to help “solve” some of these disparities by increasing available resources (Tims et al, 2012).
Limitations

The use of self-report surveys in this study remains one of its main limitations as they are only able to capture a snapshot of the complex and nuanced relationships attempting to be understood. Along this line, they are also from the employees’ point of view and based on not only their perceptions of their own processes, but also their organization’s processes and environment. Common method variance is another concern, as there is a possibility that the methods involved in this study led to differences in results (Podsakoff, 2003).

Although the intended purpose of this study was to understand the temporal changes of these constructs within individuals from an organizational sample, the response rate over these three time periods was too low to analyze from this perspective and a second sample using MTurk was obtained. The environment in sample 1 includes rigid expectations for employee performance and high levels of employee turnover. For sample 2, participants were from various organizations and reported a wide variety of job roles within the mental health field. It can be difficult to pull insights regarding organizational segmentation norms from an aggregate of this sample as they were all employees at different organizations. Participants were limited to the mental health field for this second sample but were not necessarily from the same organization.

Because temporal data was not obtained, there are limitations to the extent to which our data provides evidence of causality. Within sample 1, different participants filled out varying degrees of completeness for the survey, which made it difficult to analyze on a broader level. In line with this, the results for the job crafting measures resulted in minimally supportive results which may have been due to a lack of longitudinal data points, or participants’ ability to job craft in their work environment.
Practical Implications

Mental health or direct care employees with people-centered roles often have higher job demands and it is important to determine norms of organizations that may be associated with increased stress or demands and what factors such as individual differences or proactive coping strategies affect workplace and family outcomes. Especially at a time where virtual and hybrid work has become a mainstay in many organization’s work structures, understanding how employees might differ in boundary management strategies, how organizational norms impact them, and what types of methods or factors strengthen those relationships will help both employees and organizations align in what types of work structures are the most beneficial for improving outcomes for both. These results provide support for the idea that individuals who have a preference for segmenting their boundaries are more likely to be protected from harmful demands at work and able to experience well-being and positive experiences with family. Especially for individuals who work from home, this is important to be mindful of as it is easy for work and family boundaries to become blurred. Although job crafting had minimal positive results in this study, there were some indications that individuals who attempt to make their work domain better, easier, or improve it in some fashion had better outcomes. The ability to be proactive is an important tool for employees who may be experiencing high job demands or working in an organization without a norm for segmentation.

Future Research

The frequency with which individuals work in virtual or non-traditional work settings has greatly increased over the past decade, which calls for a renewed understanding and reconceptualization of how organizational segmentation norms interact with individual’s boundary management strategies. Using definitions, theories and conceptualizations developed
during a time that looked much different than the current global work environment calls into question how valid these are for understanding the current factors impacting how individuals choose to manage the boundaries between their domains.

As the intended purpose of this study was to understand temporal changes in these constructs from an individual level, it would be helpful to conduct this study in an organization with a larger participant pool in order to have enough data to clearly study these relationships. One of the specific dynamics that would be helpful to both organizations and individuals to more fully understand is how stress or perceived threats to an individual’s resources at work impact their reaction regarding how they alter their segmentation of boundaries between their domains.

As there were differences in participants' reports of both segmentation norms and burnout, it would be helpful to understand the impacts which created such differences in the results. Interactions between samples were also quite varied, and although there can be speculation as to why, further study into how individual differences and other factors impact these constructs is needed. Although the context of these environments were mental health agencies and direct care of mental health practitioners, studying these relationships in different participant pools would be helpful in addressing what role context plays in these interactions.

**Conclusion**

Increased frequency of virtual work environments have changed the dynamics of boundary management decisions for employees and underscored the importance of organizations being aware and purposeful of how their norms will impact their employees. Organizations with a norm for segmentation have a positive impact on employee’s ability to manage the boundaries in their work and family domains, and are associated with reduced levels of burnout, and higher levels of engagement and enrichment with family. Although individuals differ in their preference
for segmentation, this study supports the idea that a preference for segmentation is associated with more well-being, engagement at work and positive experiences with family. Because people-facing job roles can often lead to higher job demands, it is necessary for employees to have an understanding of what tools or efforts they can take to positively impact their environment, along with what types of organizational segmentation norms align with their boundary management style.
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Appendix A

Measures and Items

Segmentation Norms & Preferences

Segmentation Preferences

1. I don’t like to have to think about work while I’m at home.
2. I prefer to keep work life at work.
3. I don’t like work issues creeping into my home life.
4. I like to be able to leave work behind when I go home.

Segmentation Supplies

5. My workplace lets people forget about work when they’re at home.
6. Where I work, people can keep work matters at work.
7. At my workplace, people are able to prevent work issues from creeping into their home life.
8. Where I work, people can mentally leave work behind when they go home.

Work-Family Enrichment

My involvement in my work . . .

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 family . . .

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.

**Burnout**

1. I feel emotionally drained by my work.
2. Working with people all day long requires a great deal of effort.
3. I feel like my work is breaking me down.
4. I feel frustrated by my work.
5. I feel I work too hard at my job.
6. It stresses me too much to work in direct contact with people.
7. I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.

**Depersonalization**

8. I feel like I look after certain patients/clients impersonally, as if they are objects.
9. I feel tired when I get up in the morning and have to face another day at work.
10. I have the impression that my patients/clients make me responsible for some of their problems.

11. I am at the end of my patience at the end of my workday.

12. I really don’t care about what happens to some of my patients/clients.

13. I have become more insensitive to people since I’ve been working.

14. I’m afraid that this job is making me uncaring.

**Personal Achievement**

15. I accomplish many worthwhile things in this job.

16. I feel full of energy.

17. I am easily able to understand what my patients/clients feel.

18. I look after my patients’/clients’ problems very effectively.

19. In my work, I handle emotional problems very calmly.

20. Through my work, I feel that I have a positive influence on people.

21. I am easily able to create a relaxed atmosphere with my patients/clients.

22. I feel refreshed when I have been close to my patients/clients at work.

**Engagement**

**Physical**

1. I work with intensity on my job.

2. I exert my full effort to my job.

3. I devote a lot of energy to my job.

4. I try my hardest to perform well on my job.

5. I strive as hard as I can to complete my job.

**Emotional**
6. I am enthusiastic about my job.
7. I feel energetic at my job.
8. I am interested in my job.
9. I am proud of my job.
10. I feel positive about my job.
11. I am excited about my job.

*Cognitive*

12. At work, my mind is focused on my job.
13. At work, I pay a lot of attention to my job.
14. At work, I focus a great deal of attention on my job.
15. At work, I am absorbed by my job.
16. At work, I concentrate on my job.
17. At work, I devote a lot of attention to my job.

*Job Demands*

1. How heavy was your workload during the last 3 months?

2. In the last 3 months, how often did difficult problems arise in your work for which there were no immediate solutions?

3. How much time did you spend solving difficult work problems?

4. During a normal workweek, how frequently do exceptions arise in your work?

5. How hard is it to maintain the level of performance that is expected of you?

*Job Crafting*

*Increasing structural job resources*

1. I try to develop my capabilities.
2. I try to develop myself professionally.
3. I try to learn new things at work.
4. I make sure that I use my capacities to the fullest.
5. I decide on my own how I do things.

*Increasing social job resources*

6. I ask my supervisor to coach me.
7. I ask whether my supervisor is satisfied with my work.
8. I look to my supervisor for inspiration.
9. I ask others for feedback on my job performance.
10. I ask colleagues for advice.

*Increasing challenging job demands*

11. When an interesting project comes along, I offer myself proactively as project co-worker.
12. If there are new developments, I am one of the first to learn about them and try them out.
13. When there is not much to do at work, I see it as a chance to start new projects.
14. I regularly take on extra tasks even though I do not receive extra salary for them.
15. I try to make my work more challenging by examining the underlying relationships between aspects of my job.
## Appendix B

### Table B1.

*Means, standard deviations, and correlations for Sample 1.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Segmentation Norm</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Segmentation Preference</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work-Family Enrichment</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family-Work Enrichment</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-.72**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Depersonalization</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-.67**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal Achievement</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Engagement</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.56**</td>
<td>-.70**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Demands</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.56**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Job Crafting</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 73.*
Table B2.

*Means, standard deviations, and correlations for Sample 2.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Segmentation Norms</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Segmentation Preferences</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work-family Enrichment</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family-Work Enrichment</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Depersonalization</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.86**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal Achievement</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Engagement</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Demands</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Job Crafting</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 80.*