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ABSTRACT

CHALLENGE-HINDRANCE STRESSOR FRAMEWORK AND WORK-FAMILY OUTCOMES: THE MODERATING EFFECTS OF INDIVIDUAL LEARNING GOAL ORIENTATION

Danielle Nicole Cremeans

The challenge-hindrance stressor framework focuses on individuals’ appraisal of stressors as challenging or hindering. Most literature focuses on applying the challenge-hindrance stressor framework to performance outcomes. In contrast, the current study applies the framework to work-family outcomes while also examining the potential moderating effects of individual learning goal orientation (LGO). Ninety-seven participants completed online surveys through Amazon’s MTurk. Analyses revealed a positive relationship between challenge-related stressors and work-family conflict (WFC) as well as a positive relationship between hindrance-related stressors and WFC. Furthermore, hindrance-related stressors and LGO interacted to predict WFC. The interaction indicated that the positive relationship between hindrance-related stressors and WFC was stronger at higher levels of LGO. Additionally, a positive relationship was found between LGO and labeling a higher number of ambiguous stressors as challenge-related. This study builds on prior literature by examining individual characteristics that may influence the effects of the challenge-hindrance stressor framework as well as identifying the importance of applying the framework to work-family outcomes. Future research calls for examining the influence of time in the challenge-hindrance stressor framework as well as examining the way individuals with low and high LGO cope differently with stressors and how coping strategies could influence work-family outcomes.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Stressful conditions at work can create high cost to both the organization and the employee. According to Pfeffer (2018), organizations spend around $46 billion in excess healthcare costs that are associated with high job demands alone. However, the costs of stress are not only due to demands in the workplace. Pfeffer (2018) also found that organizations spend around $24 billion due to work-family conflict (WFC).

Both WFC and work-family enrichment (WFE) are vital constructs in both practice and research (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). WFC can affect organizational effectiveness as well as overall employee well-being as more employees in the workforce attempt to juggle their work domain and family domain (Casper, Vaziri, Wayne, DeHauw, & Greenhaus, 2018; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999). The act of juggling both work and family domains can be seen as stressful due to the demands each domain might require. However, the work domain can enrich the family domain (WFE) while the family domain can also enrich the work domain (FWE). Therefore, various studies have focused on examining antecedents and outcomes of WFC and WFE/FWE (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Collins, 2001; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Michel, Kotrba, Mitchelson, Clark, & Baltes, 2011).

Additionally, there is a longstanding need for research that identifies potential buffers of the impact of stress and work-family outcomes. Allen and Eby (2016) said that research needs to expound upon theory to help practitioners and researchers understand intra-individual experiences in the work-family interface. One potential buffer is individual goal orientation. It is important to understand various individual buffers because individual traits such as goal
orientation may play a role in the way individuals respond to stressors (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005).

Moreover, the current literature on the challenge-hindrance stressor framework focuses only on work-related performance outcomes (Boswell, Olson-Buchanan, & LePine, 2004; Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, & Boudreau, 2000; LePine et al., 2005). However, the challenge-hindrance stressor framework could also be applied to work-family outcomes since more employees are attempting to juggle work and family domains (Casper et al., 2018). Accordingly, the purpose of the current study is to address and contribute to the lack of research in regard to challenge and hindrance-related stressors’ influence on work-family outcomes while taking into consideration the moderating effects of individual learning goal orientation (LGO) in addition to answering several calls within the literature to make work-family more practical (e.g., Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007; Kossek, Baltes, & Matthews, 2011; Lyness, Judiesch, & Erkovan, 2018). The following sections draw upon the conceptual model presented in Figure 1. The model assumes that challenge and hindrance-related stressors will predict WFE and WFC, with a moderating effect of LGO.

![Proposed moderated model of challenge and hindrance-related stressors influence on work-family outcomes with moderating effects of learning goal orientation.](image)

**Figure 1.** Proposed moderated model of challenge and hindrance-related stressors influence on work-family outcomes with moderating effects of learning goal orientation.
**Challenge-Hindrance Stressor Framework**

Stress can have positive and enhancing effects on employee performance (Cavanaugh et al., 2000; Boswell et al., 2004). Specifically, the challenge-hindrance stress framework suggests that there can be positive outcomes related to facing stressors (Boswell et al., 2004; Cavanaugh et al., 2000; LePine et al., 2005). The framework is based on Lazarus and Folkman's theory (1984), which argues that employees experience positive and negative forms of stress based on their appraisal of work demands as challenging or hindering and that their response to a stressor depends on the appraisal process.

Challenge-related stressors (i.e., positive stressors) and hindrance-related stressors (i.e., negative stressors) are antecedents to both positive and negative performance outcomes (e.g., Breevaart & Bakker, 2014; Cavanaugh et al., 2000; Le Fèvre, Matheny, & Kolt, 2003; LePine et al., 2005). When experiencing challenge-related stressors, employees often feel motivated and engaged (LePine, LePine, & Jackson, 2004; LePine et al., 2005; Nelson & Simmons, 2011). Challenge-related stressors promote personal growth and achievement of the employee (Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007), and have a positive relationship with favorable work outcomes such as job satisfaction (Cavanaugh et al., 2000). Although both challenge and hindrance-related stressors cause strain (LePine et al., 2005), challenge-related stressors are perceived as rewarding experiences that are worth the discomfort involved. Examples of challenge-related stressors include an impending deadline, more responsibility, time stressors, and job complexity (Cavanaugh et al., 2000).

Both challenge and hindrance-related stressors are linked with adverse health outcomes such as burnout and exhaustion (Crawford, LePine, Rich, 2010; LePine et al., 2005). However, hindrance-related stressors are known as negative stressors (Cavanaugh et al., 2000). Hindrance-related stressors are associated with undesirable outcomes such as turnover intention (Podsakoff
et al., 2007). Additionally, hindrance-related stressors are labeled as obstacles to successful performance that cannot be overcome through increased effort. Examples of hindrance-related stressors include role overload, role ambiguity, and obstacles that cannot be overcome (Cavanaugh et al., 2000).

The current study contributes to the challenge-hindrance stressor framework literature by expanding the framework to work-family outcomes as well as answering the call to identify individual buffers that may influence the way in which individuals respond to stressors (Lepine et al., 2005).

**Work-Family Enrichment and Challenge-Related Stressors**

WFE has been defined as “the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role” (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006, p. 73). WFE represents how work and family benefit each other (Greenhaus, Allen, & Foley, 2004). Specifically, enrichment occurs when resources gained from one role directly or indirectly improve performance in another role. WFE consists of three facets: capital, affect, and development. Work-family capital occurs when work promotes psychosocial resources (e.g., security, confidence) that helps the individual become a better family member (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006). Work-family affect describes the way in which involvement at work creates a positive attitude which helps the individual become a better family member (Carlson et al., 2006). The last facet, work-family development, occurs when one’s involvement in work promotes the acquisition or refinement of skills, knowledge, behaviors, or ways of viewing things that help an individual become a better family member (Carlson et al., 2006).

Current literature tends to focus primarily on environmental resources as antecedents of WFE and lacks investigation of other antecedents such as stressors (Greenhaus et al., 2004; Grzywacz, Almeida, & McDonald, 2002; Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004). The lack of
research identifying other predictors of WFE could be a result of WFC overshadowing WFE in the literature (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; McNall, Nicklin, & Masuda, 2010; Shockley & Singla, 2011). The current study attempts to extend the literature by investigating the impact of stressors on work-family outcomes as well as contributing specifically to the lack of WFE research.

Broaden-and-build theory (Frederickson 1998, 2001) provides a framework to understand how challenge-related stressors experienced in the work domain can evoke positive emotions, which could improve the quality of life in an individual’s family domain and create WFE. Challenge-related stressors have been found to trigger positive emotions and have the potential to promote personal gain and growth (LePine et al., 2005). Broaden-and-build theory expounds on positive emotions by stating that positive emotions appear to broaden individual’s momentary thought-action repertoires while also helping individuals build their own personal resources (Fredrickson, 1998, 2001). Individuals who experience positive emotions regularly find positive meaning in life (Fredrickson, 2001) as well as deepen their individual scopes of attention and cognition (Aspinwall, 1998; Fredrickson & Joiner, 2002). Broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions is associated with challenge-related stressors because they can elicit positive feelings of euphoria (McCauley, Ruderman, Ohlott, & Morrow, 1994), which can translate to positive emotions. Positive emotions elicited from challenge-related stressors can trigger upward spirals toward greater well-being (Fredrickson, 2001).

Additionally, challenge-related stressors are positively related to employee motivation (LePine et al., 2005). The positive relationship may exist because people who experience challenge-related stressors are likely to believe that a positive relationship exists between effort expended on coping with demands from challenge-related stressors and the likelihood of meeting those demands (LePine et al., 2005). Similarly, individuals faced with challenge-related stressors
believe they can succeed and cope by using their resources for personal gains, in hopes of acquiring more resources (Dawson, O’Brien, & Beehr, 2016).

Conservation of resources (COR) theory provides a reasonable theoretical framework for associating resource gain with challenge-related stressors. COR states that individuals strive to “protect, accumulate, and maintain resources” because they are valued by the individual (Hobfoll, 1989 p. 516). As mentioned previously, challenge-related stressors can promote positive emotions, which in return, can promote an individual’s personal resources (Fredrickson, 2001). An example of a personal resource that could emerge from challenge-related stressors is a positively challenging routine (Hobfoll, 1989). The fulfillment of acquiring more resources and feelings of positive emotions from the work domain have the potential of spilling over into the family domain.

Additionally, work-family constructs are found to be domain specific (Frone Russell, & Cooper, 1992). Domain specificity suggests that predictors of WFE reside in the work domain. Using this framework, challenge-related stressors presented in the work domain may influence WFE. Based on the logic of COR, broaden-and-build, and domain specificity theories, challenge-related stressors in the work domain may create WFE.

Hypothesis 1: Individuals who experience challenge-related stressors will report greater WFE (i.e., composite of all facets; work-family capital, work-family affect, and work-family development).

Family-Work Enrichment and Challenge-Related Stressors

WFE is bidirectional (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Specifically, WFE occurs when experiences at work improve the quality of family life, and family-to-work enrichment (FWE) occurs when family experiences improve the quality of work life. In other words, the effects of work and family experiences have the potential to enhance overall well-being.
There are three forms of FWE: family-work development, family-work affect, and family-work efficiency. Family-work development occurs when involvement in family leads to the acquisition or refinement of skills, knowledge, behaviors, or ways of viewing things that help the individual become a better worker. Family-work affect is the notion that involvement in family results in a positive emotional state or attitude which helps the individual be a better worker. Lastly, family-work efficiency refers to when involvement in family provides a sense of focus or urgency which helps the individual be a better worker (Carlson et al., 2006). For the purposes of this thesis, only the family-work development facet will be used.

The transfer of skills and knowledge in the family-work development facet can be associated with learning, and as mentioned previously, learning can be transferred from one context to another (Perkins & Salomon, 1992). It is likely that learned skills and knowledge from the family domain can be positively transferred to the work domain. In regard to combating stressors in the work domain, it is likely that affect and efficiency would not transfer across domains as well as the development facet. Family-work affect is likely not a resource that helps combat stressors at work. Along with this, the focus outcome that results from family-work efficiency, is likely not helpful in the context with challenge-related or hindrance-related stressors due to the focus that stressors already promote. Additionally, compared to the other facets of FEW, family-work development helps the individual attain resources that can help combat the stain induced by stressors at work.

Enrichment occurs when resources gained from one role directly or indirectly improve performance in the other role (Carlson et al., 2006). Hobfoll (1989) argued that resources can include having a good relationship with family and learning from others. If an individual is exposed to resources in their family domain (e.g., learning from family), they have the potential of accumulating additional resources in the work domain (e.g., accomplishing goals, positively
challenging routine), which can further increase the acquisition of resources challenge-related stressors may already prompt (Cavanaugh et al., 2000; Hobfoll, 1989).

Resources developed in the family domain (e.g., refinement of skills and knowledge) will likely be applied successfully to the work domain where the individual is facing the challenge-related stressor, which is consistent with results from Carlson and colleagues’ (2006) research. They found that resource-rich work and family environments that promote acquisition of new skills, feedback, or emotional support increase enrichment. Because challenge-related stressors are known to elicit positive outcomes (e.g., motivation, engagement, positive emotions), the family-work development aspect is likely viewed as a positive resource, thus enhancing WFE.

Hypothesis 2: Individuals who experience challenge-related stressors will report greater family to work development.

**Work-Family Conflict and Challenge and Hindrance-Related Stressors**

WFC is defined as, “a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 77). Research has studied various antecedents of WFC in both the work and family domain. Examples are role stressors, role involvement, social support, and work/family characteristics (Michel et al., 2011). Research linking personality antecedents to WFC focus primarily on internal locus of control and negative affect/neuroticism (Michel et al., 2011). In this study, family to work conflict (FWC) will not be assessed because conflict (e.g., hindrance/challenge stressor) will be examined in the work domain. This rationale is supported by the domain specificity argument mentioned previously (Frone et al., 1992) as well as source attribution theory which suggests that individuals psychologically attribute blame to the domain that was source of conflict (Shockley & Singla, 2011). Because workplace factors do not immediately impact the family domain, there should be a less direct relationship with how much
the family domain interferes with work. Therefore, because the stressor is presented in the work domain, it is reasonable to only look at the work to family direction in regard to WFC.

Job stressors in general are positively related to WFC (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Moreover, job involvement has been labeled as a challenge stressor and is also positively related to WFC (Cavanaugh et al., 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). The positive relationship between job involvement and WFC might exist because challenge-related stressors presented in the work domain (e.g., job involvement) elicit engagement and attention (Cavanaugh et al., 2000) which results in an increase in job involvement. Challenge-related stressors are engaging in the work domain but may take away resources from the family domain. An individual’s resources are limited (Hobfoll, 1989) and the engagement challenge-related stressors elicit could exhaust all individual resources. Furthermore, challenge-related stressors may have detrimental effects on individual health such as burnout and emotional exhaustion (Crawford et al., 2010; LePine et al., 2005), similar to hindrance stressors. Thus, it is likely that individuals who are exposed to challenge-related stressors in the work domain will report more WFC.

Hypothesis 3: Individuals who experience challenge-related stressors will report more WFC.

As opposed to challenge-related stressors, individuals may perceive hindrance-related stressors not worth the strain they induce (Podsakoff et al., 2007). In fact, hindrance-related stressors may prohibit personal growth (Cavanaugh et al., 2000). It logically follows that hindrance stressors have the potential to promote conflict.

Individuals try to protect their limited resources while accumulating additional resources (Hobfoll, 1989). Resources have been defined as anything that may help an individual attain his or her goal (Halbesleben, Neveu, Paustian-Underdahl, & Westman, 2014). Hindrance stressors are seen as obstacles that prevent an individual from attaining his or her goal (Cavanaugh et al.,
2000) and are likely to be seen as resource threats. Additionally, individuals facing hindrance-related stressors may perceive their efforts toward coping with hindrance stressors to be inadequate, and therefore, be more likely to conserve their resources (Dawson et al., 2016). The act of conserving resources may prevent an individual from successfully coping with the emotional exhaustion related to hindrance stressors (Crawford et al., 2010; LePine et al., 2005). Therefore, one undergoing hindrance stressors may not be able to meet the demands required by their family domain. It is hypothesized that individuals who face hindrance stressors will report greater levels of WFC.

Hypothesis 4: Individuals who experience hindrance-related stressors will report greater WFC.

Goal Orientation

Goals can be motivating to a wide variety of individuals. However, the extent to which individuals set goals and their expected outcomes differ among people. Specifically, individuals differ in their level and type of goal orientation. Goal orientation is commonly studied as a motivational variable in applied psychology and is one of the most dominant approaches in the study of achievement motivation (DeShon & Gillespie, 2005).

According to DeShon and Gillespie (2005), the definition of goal orientation is inconsistent in the literature. It has been defined in a variety of ways (e.g., as goals, traits, beliefs), and has been examined at varying levels of stability (e.g., situationally specific, domain specific, and trait). For the purposes of this study, goal orientation is considered a trait, which is consistent with prior challenge and hindrance stressor literature (LePine, 2005).

Goal orientation has been used to predict learning and adaptive behavior in various contexts (e.g., training, sales performance, goal setting). Individuals hold either a learning or performance goal orientation toward tasks. LGO refers to individuals who have a desire to
increase task competency and approach tasks with the intention of developing skills and abilities (Phillips & Gully, 1997). Individuals with performance goal orientation view their capabilities as fixed and approach their only intention is to perform well (Phillips & Gully, 1997). In LePine, Podsakoff, and Lepine’s (2005) meta-analysis of the challenge-hindrance stressor framework, they suggested that individual traits such as goal orientation may influence the way individuals respond to stressful work demands. Additionally, they called upon future researchers to look at this possible relationship.

**The Moderating Effects of Learning Goal Orientation**

In this study, LGO will be the only goal orientation studied due to its potential relevance to the other constructs in the study. Researchers have found that LGO impacts employees’ skill acquisition and learning at work (Hirst, Van Knippenberg, & Zhou, 2009; Tan, Au, Cooper-Thomas, & Aw 2016). Additionally, individuals who hold LGO usually see past experiences (even failure) as positive and view these experiences as opportunities to learn. They pursue an adaptive response pattern in which they persist and enjoy challenge (Dweck & Leggett, 1988).

Employees with high LGO proactively seek new information and methods to acquire role, organizational, and social learning (Tan et al., 2016), and therefore may be more likely to acquire resources. Additionally, LGO has been found to buffer the effect of workload on well-being and frustration (Van Yperen & Janssen, 2002; Whinghter, Cunningham, Wang, & Burnfield, 2008), and therefore may help reduce strain caused from stressors. Employees with high LGO report feeling less frustrated with hindrance-related stressors and more likely to persist even with obstacles present, because they consider these stressors as part of their learning process (Sujan, Weitz, & Kumar, 1994). Drawing from prior literature, it is likely that individuals high in LGO will label more stressors as challenge-related stressors because they will be more likely to appraise stressors as opportunities to learn and acquire more knowledge.
Hypothesis 5: High LGO will be linked with identifying a higher number of ambiguous stressors as challenge-related (vs. hindrance-related).

Stressors, Work-Family Enrichment, and the Moderating Effects of LGO

Employees with low levels of LGO are more likely to believe they lack resources to cope effectively with high levels of challenge-related stressors (Hobfoll, 1989). Individuals low in LGO are also more likely to avoid resource acquisition behaviors and seek to preserve their resources through resource conservation methods (Halbesleben & Bowler, 2007). When facing challenge-related stressors, employees high in LGO may be more motivated to engage in innovative behaviors to acquire resources (Peng, Zhang, Xu, Matthews, & Jex, 2018). Additionally, employees with high LGO are less frustrated by hindrance stressors and are more likely to persevere against obstacles (Dweck, 1986). Further, LGO has also been suggested to be a factor in fostering skill acquisition (Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby, & Herron, 1996).

If individuals experience challenge-related stressors in the work domain, the opportunity to develop skills and to learn (even if the outcome results in failure) may create positive emotions for the individual who holds high LGO and lead to the acquisition or refinement of skills, knowledge, and behaviors that help an individual become a better family member (Carlson et al., 2006). Previous research found that learning new skills from challenge-related stressors is energizing for individuals high in LGO (DeShon & Gillespie, 2005). Skills developed from challenge-related stressors can likely be transferred from one context to another (Perkins & Salomon, 1992). Therefore, skills, positive emotions and psychosocial resources elicited from challenge-related stressors are likely to spill over into the individual’s family domain according to the broaden-and-build theory and positive transfer of learned skills. Thus, individuals with high LGO are especially likely to have WFE when faced with challenge-related stressors.
Hypothesis 6: The link between challenge-related stressors and WFE will be moderated by LGO such that the link between challenge-related stressors and WFE will be greater for individuals with high (vs. low) LGO.

Having high LGO may be beneficial to the work domain as well as the family domain. Carlson et al. (2006) stated that family-work development occurs when involvement in family leads to the acquisition or refinement of skills, knowledge, behaviors, or ways of viewing things that help an individual become a better worker. Related to this, individuals who hold LGO are motivated by learning new skills and obtain resources that help them learn more and increase task competence (DeShon & Gillespie, 2005; Tan et al., 2016). An individual’s family is considered to be a type of resource (Hobfoll, 1989), and one’s family may help obtain additional resources that help them learn more and increase task competence (Carlson et al., 2006). Thus, it is likely that individuals with high LGO will value additional resources gained from family members and use their resources to overcome challenge-related stressors because of the characteristics of someone with high LGO (e.g., seek to acquire additional resources to learn).

Hypothesis 7: The link between challenge-related stressors and family-work development enrichment will be moderated by LGO such that the link between challenge-related stressors and family-work development enrichment will be greater for individuals with high (vs. low) LGO.

Stressors, Work-Family Conflict, and the Moderating Effects of LGO

Both theory and research support the notion that LGO is likely to buffer any relationship between stressors and WFC (e.g., Hobfoll, 1989; Whinghter et al., 2008). According to Whinghter et al. (2008), individuals with lower LGO experience more frustration when faced with heavy quantitative workloads. The positive relationship between low LGO and frustration was either less pronounced or reversed for high LGO individuals. The results suggest that
individuals with high LGO may seek out work situations that allow them to confront and overcome workload demands. It is likely that because individuals high in LGO are more apt to seek out workload demands, these demands may take up a lot of their time at work and may relate to strain due to an exhaust of resources (Cavanaugh et al., 2000; Hobfoll, 1989; LePine et al., 2005). Additionally, strain and negative health outcomes (e.g., depression, burnout) associated with challenge-related stressors (Crawford et al., 2010; LePine et al., 2005) in the work domain are likely to increase difficulty when dealing with situations in the family domain.

Because high LGO individuals are more likely to value learning and task competence, they may view challenge-related stressors as engaging and motivating (DeShon & Gillespie, 2005). The engagement produced from challenge-related stressors in the work domain is likely to take away resources required by the family domain. Thus, challenge-related stressors are likely to create WFC for individuals high in LGO.

Hypothesis 8: The link between challenge-related stressors and WFC will be moderated by LGO such that the link between challenge-related stressors and WFC will be greater for individuals with high (vs. low) LGO.

When faced with hindrance stressors, employees with high LGO are less disturbed and frustrated and are more likely to persist (Dweck, 1986) because they consider hindrance stressors to be a part of the learning process (Sujan et al., 1994). However, persisting in spite of obstacles that have been labeled as impossible to overcome (Cavanaugh, et al., 2000) may result in frustration and burnout (LePine et al., 2005). Additionally, showing persistence when faced with hindrance-related stressors in the work domain is likely to exhaust individual resources which could leave an individual unable to meet the demands required within their family domain. The inability to meet demands is likely to be true for someone high in LGO who is more likely to spend time and resources trying to overcome obstacles in order to feel a sense of task
competence (Dweck, 1986). The JD-R model (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2000) further supports this by suggesting that demands (e.g., role overload, ambiguity) that are not met with adequate resources are associated with frustration and burnout. Simply put, the obstacle might require a great deal of resources in the work domain and inflict strain for someone high in LGO who is geared towards overcoming obstacles to increase task competence. Therefore, it is unlikely that an individual will have adequate resources to meet the demands in their family domain.

Hypothesis 9: The link between hindrance-related stressors and WFC will be moderated by LGO such that the link between hindrance-related stressors and WFC will be greater for individuals with high (vs. low) LGO.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Participants and Procedure

Participants were recruited for online surveys through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk). The online forum provides access to individuals interested in completing tasks such as surveys and questionnaires for a nominal fee. Buhrmester, Kwang, and Gosling (2011) argue that MTurk samples are more demographically diverse than college samples and found that data from MTurk meets acceptable psychometric quality criteria (e.g., high test-retest reliability). Furthermore, evidence that MTurk is a valid means of collecting data is consistent and continues to accumulate (Mason & Suri, 2012). Also, because participants through MTurk are paid after completion of a survey, they are more likely to finish the survey once they start (Göritz, 2006).

Participants received $0.10 for completion of the prescreen survey, $1.00 for completing survey at time one, and $1.00 for completing survey at time two. The prescreen was important in order to have a representative sample of participants that likely experienced challenge/hindrance-related stressors and work-family outcomes. Sample items from the prescreen included: “How many hours a week do you currently work?” and “Is MTurk your primary source of employment?” (Appendix A). Participants who worked 20 or more hours per week and had a primary source of employment outside of MTurk qualified for survey one. After successful completion of survey one (e.g., passing two out of the three attention check items), participants were eligible for survey two. The two surveys were spaced apart by one day. Challenge and hindrance-related stressors as well as LGO were analyzed at time one, and work-family outcomes were analyzed at time two. Cross-sectional studies are more likely to have common method bias (i.e., variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than to the
constructs the measures represent) and analyzing the variables of interest at different time points can help reduce the likelihood of bias (Podsakoff et al., 2007).

At the beginning of both surveys, participants read and agreed to a consent form that explained the current study and stated participant confidentiality (Appendix B). Participants indicated their consent by selecting “next” to begin each survey. A day after successful completion of survey one (e.g., answering all questions, passing data quality checks), participants completed survey two containing all measures from survey one, with the exception of demographics (Appendices D, E, and F). Demographic information requested at survey one included: gender, marital status, occupational title, hours worked, level of education, and how many dependents the participant had at the time of the survey (Appendix G). Upon competition of the survey, participants received a debriefing statement (Appendix H).

Methodology

Cross-sectional studies are often viewed as negative because they do not permit causal inference. However, Spector (2019) recently discussed the value of cross-sectional designs. Spector’s (2019) logic would support that a cross-sectional design was appropriate method for this study. Current literature has not indicated whether challenge and hindrance-related stressors, LGO, WFE, and WFC covary. The use of cross-sectional design can extend the literature by indicating whether the variables are actually related and whether moderators may buffer the relationships as well as rule out potential alternative explanations for why variables are related (e.g., through the use of control variables; Spector, 2019). Indicating potential relationships is extremely valuable to extend the literature and serve as a basis for theory.

Measures

Challenge/hindrance stressors. Cavanaugh et al.’s (2000) 16-item scale was used to measure challenge and hindrance stressors (Appendix C). Responses were measured on a 5-point
Likert scale ranging from 1 (*produces no stress*) to 5 (*produces a great deal of stress*). The first 11 items were categorized as challenge or hindrance stressors. A sample challenge item included the perception of “time pressures I experience.” A sample hindrance item included the perception of “the lack of job security I have.” The last five items labeled “other” (not clearly falling in either challenge or hindrance category) were included in addition to the first 11 items for the purpose of asking participants to label the items as challenging or hindering. The five items in the other category were a mixture of sample relevant items from the Job Demands and Worker Health Study (Caplan, Cobb, & French, 1975) and the Stress Diagnostic Survey (Ivancevich, Matteson, Freedman, & Phillips, 1990). A sample item from the other category included “The opportunities for career development I have had.” Coefficient alpha for the challenge and hindrance items were .91 and .77, respectively. The entire scale had a coefficient alpha of .87. The last five items labeled other are ambiguous and were known not to fall on a specific facet (e.g., challenge-related, hindrance-related).

**Individual learning goal orientation (LGO).** Vandewalle’s (1997) six-item scale was used to measure individual learning goal orientation (Appendix D). Responses were measured on a 5-point Likert Scale 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). A sample item included, “I enjoy challenging and difficult tasks where I’ll learn new skills.” Coefficient alpha was .87.

**Work-family enrichment.** Carlson et al.’s (2006) WFE measure was used (Appendix E). The work to family enrichment direction included measures of work-family development, work-family affect, and work-family capital. All three measures were used in analysis. For the purposes of this thesis the only facet of the family to work enrichment measure used was the family-work development facet. The responses were measured on a 5-point Likert Scale 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Sample items from this scale included the following: “Helps me to gain knowledge and this helps me be a better family member” (work to family
development), “Puts me in a good mood and this helps me be a better family member” (work to family affect), “Provides me with a sense of success and this helps me be a better family member” (work to family capital), and “Helps me to gain knowledge and this helps me be a better worker” (family to work development). Coefficient alpha for WFE was .93 and .92 for family-work development.

**Work-family conflict.** Netemeyer, Boles, and McMurrian’s (1996) WFC measure was used (Appendix F). The responses were measured on a 5-point Likert Scale based on agreement from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). A sample item was, “The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life.” Additionally, the scale is known as the best scale in general for measuring WFC in regard to reliability, validity, and test information (Min, Matthews, Parsons, & Wayne, 2018). Coefficient alpha was .94.
Chapter III

RESULTS

Data Screening

Data cleaning consisted of checking for outliers, identification of participants failing data quality checks, participants not meeting eligibility requirements, and any duplicate responses. Participants within any of these categories were excluded from final data analyses. Additionally, any participant whose primary employment was MTurk or any participant who worked less than 20 hours was excluded from data analysis.

To ensure data quality, Captcha verification was included at the beginning of each survey and three attention check items were included throughout each survey to ensure that participants were attending to the survey. The attention check items consisted of questions with clearly correct answers to help identify careless responding from participants when they answer questions incorrectly (e.g., “for data quality purposes, please leave this question blank”; Beach, 1989). Additionally, the attention checks helped discourage spammers and other fake users, which helped with quality assurance on MTurk (Mason & Suri, 2012). Any participant failing two out of three attention check items were excluded from final data analyses.

Participants completed the first survey and then completed the second survey 24 hours later. The first survey was capped at 274 participants. Out of the 274 participants that completed the first survey, 236 participants were eligible to take the second survey based on passing at least two out of three data quality checks. The response rate for the second survey was 56%. After data cleaning (e.g., failed data quality checks, inconsistent responses between time 1 and time 2) and screening for careless responding, 97 participants were eligible for analyses.

Assumptions. As mentioned previously, multiple regressions were used to determine any significant relationships. To ensure accurate results, assumptions related to the multiple
regressions were checked and addressed accordingly. Specific assumptions related to multiple regressions include reliability of measures, univariate outliers, linearity, homoscedasticity of residuals, multicollinearity, and multivariate outliers.

**Reliability of measures.** With regression, it is assumed that measurement error in the independent variables (e.g., predictors) is minimized and within acceptable range. To confirm this assumption, a reliability analysis was performed, and all measures with reliabilities of at least .70 were used.

**Univariate outliers.** A univariate outlier consists of an extreme value on one variable. To check for univariate outliers, box plots were created through SPSS. Any values that were starred indicated outliers. After checking for normality, any outliers were Winsorized (i.e., transformed extreme values to two standard deviations from the mean).

**Linearity.** To check for linearity, a scatterplot was created with each IV and DV. A Loess line was used to determine if the relationship is linear. The Loess line appeared to be straight for each IV and DV.

**Homoscedasticity of residuals.** When the variance of the residuals around the regression line is constant (regardless of value X), it is called homoscedasticity. Residual distances are also assumed to have a normal distribution around the regression line. When the variance of the residuals is unequally dispersed around the regression line, it is considered an assumption violation (i.e., heteroscedasticity). Heteroscedasticity can lead to errors in the calculation of standard error. Homoscedasticity was checked through creating scatterplots of the X and standardized residuals. The plot shape appeared linear, therefore transformation was not required.

**Multicollinearity.** Multicollinearity occurs when IVs are correlated with each other. Correlations between IVs are problematic because IVs should be independent. To account for
multicollinearity, correlations between all study variables was examined. No correlations exceeded .8, and therefore, study variables did not seem to violate the assumption of multicollinearity. Additionally, all control variables, predictors, and interaction terms were mean centered to account for multicollinearity.

**Multivariate outliers.** Multivariate outliers occur when there are unusual scores on more than one variable. This can occur from careless responding, so it is important that any multivariate outliers are accounted for before analyses. To check for multivariate outliers, the externalized studentized range statistic was used. The studentized range statistic indicated six values that exceeded the |2| threshold. Therefore, these values were excluded from analyses.

**Approach to missing data.** For item-level missingness, maximum likelihood (ML) using expectation maximization algorithm (EM) was applied. Once item-level missingness was addressed, the data set did not have any construct level missingness. Person-level missingness was completely removed from analyses (Newman, 2014).

**Power analysis.** An ad hoc power analysis was conducted using G*power with an effect size of .41. The effect size estimate was selected due to its equivalence to effect sizes used in previous work stress and work-family literature (Allen, Herst, Bruck & Sutton, 2000; Shockley & Singla, 2011). The power analysis revealed that approximately 60 participants would be necessary for a power of .80.

**Descriptive Statistics**

After cleaning data based on eligibility (e.g., passing Captcha verification, correctly responding to at least two attention check items) and identifying outliers, 97 participants were included in final data analyses. Table 1 shows descriptive statistics and correlations. Challenge-related stressors were significantly related to WFE, \( r(126) = -.30, p < .001 \). Likewise, challenge-related stressors were significantly related to WFC, \( r(126) = .67, p < .001 \). Despite expectations,
challenge-related stressors were not significantly related to family to work development, \( r(126) = -.04, n.s. \) Hindrance-related stressors were significantly related to WFC, \( r(126) = .59, p < .001. \) Additionally, LGO was significantly related to family to work development, \( r(126) = .27, p < .001 \) and WFE, \( r(126) = .37, p < .001. \) Contrary to expectations, LGO was not significantly related to WFC, \( r(126) = -.11, n.s. \)

Table 1

**Bivariate Correlations and Descriptive Statistics for all Study Variables**

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Family Enrichment</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-Work Development</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Family Conflict</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge-Related Stressors</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance-Related Stressors</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal Orientation</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 121, **p < .01. Alphas are listed in bold along the diagonal.*

**Control variables.** Becker (2005) suggests that control variables are as important as independent and dependent variables. Therefore, a theoretical approach to selecting control variables was taken including only retaining control variables that had significant beta weight (Becker, 2005). PROCESS Macro (Hayes, 2012) was used to test all potential controls (e.g., extraversion, neuroticism, domain centrality, negative affect, age, gender, number of children) for each regression. Each regression was analyzed separately with all potential controls placed in
the covariate section. Any control variable with significant beta weight to the dependent variable was retained for analyses (Becker, 2005). Positive affect was retained for analyses due to significant beta weight with WFE and FEW. Additionally, conscientiousness was retained for analyses due to significant beta weight with WFC.

**Test of hypotheses.** Multiple regression analyses were performed through PROCESS Macro (Hayes, 2012) to test Hypotheses 1-4 and 6-9. Hierarchical multiple regressions were used to test Hypothesis 5 and potential controls. To prevent multicollinearity, main effects were mean centered prior to creating interaction terms. In PROCESS Macro, mean centering was performed automatically through checking the appropriate box in the software. Tables 2-6 contain the unstandardized coefficients ($B$), standardized error of the unstandardized coefficients ($SE\ B$), standardized coefficients ($\beta$) and semi-partial correlations ($sr_i^2$).

Hypothesis 1 and 6 were tested with the same regression equation, which is reported in Table 2. Hypothesis 1 predicted that individuals who experience challenge-related stressors would report greater WFE and Hypothesis 6 predicted that LGO would serve as a moderator to the relationship predicted in Hypothesis 1. The $R^2$ was significantly different from zero, $F(4,92) = 29.43, p < .000, R^2 = .24$. Positive affect was significantly related to WFE ($\beta = .46, p < .000$). LGO was also significantly related to WFE ($\beta = 1.06, p < .005$). The $R$ for the main effects was significantly different from zero, $F(4,92) = 16.95, p < .000, R^2 = .35$. The significant relationship found in Hypothesis 1 was in the opposite direction from what was expected and therefore was not supported ($\beta = -.68, p = .002$). The $R$ for the interaction and main effects was significantly different from zero, $F(4,92) = 12.58, p < .001, R^2 = .35$. Contrary to expectations, challenge-related stressors did not interact with LGO ($\beta = .05, p = .90 \text{n.s.}$) and therefore Hypothesis 6 was not supported.
**Table 2**

*Regression Analysis with Challenge-Related Stressors and Learning Goal Orientation as Predictors of Work-Family Enrichment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>sr²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge-Related Stressors</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.28***</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGO</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge-Related Stressors X LGO</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.***p < .001. LGO indicates learning goal orientation. F(4,92) = 16.95, p < .000, R² = .35.*

Hypothesis 2 and 7 were tested with the same regression equation, which is reported in Table 3. Hypothesis 2 predicted individuals who experience challenge-related stressors would report greater family to work development. Hypothesis 7 predicted that LGO would serve as a moderator to the relationship predicted in Hypothesis 2. The R was significantly different from zero, F(1, 95) = 29.90, p < .001, R² = .24. Positive affect was significantly related to family-work development (β = .46, p = .000). LGO was not significantly related to family-work development (β = .13, p = .35 n.s). The R for the main effects was significantly different from zero, F(3,93) = 10.40, p < .001, R² = .25. Contrary to expectations, Hypothesis 2 was not supported, and challenge-related stressors did not predict greater family to work development (β = .09, p = .74 n.s.). The R for the interaction and main effects was significantly different from zero, F(4,92) = 7.83, p < .001, R² = .25. However, contrary to Hypothesis 7, challenge-related stressors did not interact with LGO (β = -.10, p = .55 n.s.).
Table 3

*Regression Analysis with Challenge-Related Stressors and Learning Goal Orientation as Predictors of Family-Work Enrichment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>sr²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge-Related Stressors</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGO</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge-Related Stressors X LGO</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*** p < .001. LGO indicates learning goal orientation. F(3,93) = 10.40, p < .001, R² = .25.*

Hypothesis 3 and 8 were tested with the same regression equation, which is reported in Table 4. Hypothesis 3 predicted individuals who experience more challenge-related stressors would report more WFC. Hypothesis 8 predicted that LGO would serve as a moderator to the relationship predicted in Hypothesis 3. The R was significantly different from zero, F(1, 95) = 18.24, p < .001, R² = .16. Conscientiousness was significantly related to WFC (β = -.37, p = .000) and LGO was not significantly related to WFC (β = -.11, p = .44 n.s.). The R for the main effects was significantly different from zero, F(2, 93) = 38.23, p < .001, R² = .55. Hypothesis 3 was supported as evidenced by the significant positive relationship between challenge-related stressors and WFC (β = .73, p = .000). The R for the interaction and main effects was significantly different from zero F(4,92) = 30.54, p <.001, R² = .55. However, Hypothesis 8 was not supported, and challenge-related stressors did not interact with LGO (β = .33, p = .051 n.s.).
Table 4

Regression Analysis with Challenge-Related Stressors and Learning Goal Orientation as Predictors and Work-Family Conflict as Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>sr²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge-Related Stressors</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGO</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge-Related Stressors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGO</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *** p < .001. LGO indicates learning goal orientation. F(2, 93) = 38.23, p < .001, R² = .55.

Hypothesis 4 and 9 were tested with the same regression equation, which is reported in Table 6. Hypothesis 4 predicted individuals who experience more hindrance-related stressors would report more WFC. Hypothesis 9 predicted that LGO would serve as a moderator to the relationship predicted in Hypothesis 4. The R for the main effects was significantly different from zero, F(2, 94) = 25.38, p < .001, R² = .35. Hypothesis 4 was supported as evidenced by the significant positive relationship between hindrance-related stressors and WFC (β = .68, p = .000). LGO was not significantly related to WFC (β = -.08, p = .61 n.s.). The step containing all variables including the interaction showed that the R was significantly different from zero F(3, 93) = 21.39, p < .001, R² = .41. Hypothesis 9 was supported as evidenced by the significant interaction between hindrance-related stressors and LGO (β = .59, p = .003). Examination of the interaction plot indicated that the positive relationship between hindrance-related stressors and WFC was stronger at higher levels of LGO (see Figure 2 and Table 6). The results indicate that for low LGO, there is no relationship between hindrance-related stressors and WFC, b = .38, t(93) = 2.44, p = .02. The results indicate that for average LGO, there is a positive significant relationship between hindrance-related stressors and WFC, b = .69, t(93) = 6.55, p = .00. The
results indicate for high LGO, there is a positive significant relationship between hindrance-related stressors and WFC, $b = 1.01$, $t(93) = 7.49$, $p = .00$.

Table 5

Regression Analysis with Hindrance-Related Stressors and Learning Goal Orientation as Predictors and Work-Family Conflict as Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance-Related Stressors</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGO</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance-Related Stressors X LGO</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *** $p < .001$. LGO indicates learning goal orientation. $F(2, 94) = 25.38$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .35$.

Figure 2. Significant interaction between hindrance-related stressors and LGO. WFC indicates work-family conflict, LGO indicates learning goal orientation.
Table 6

*Interaction Between Hindrance-Related Stressors and Learning Goal Orientation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGO</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One SD below mean</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the mean</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One SD above mean</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LGO indicates learning goal orientation.

Hypothesis 5 predicted LGO would be linked with identifying a higher number of ambiguous stressors as challenge-related compared to hindrance-related and was tested with a regression equation. The $R$ for the main effect was significantly different from zero, $F(1, 76) = 8.52, p < .005, R^2 = .10$. Hypothesis 5 was supported as evidenced by the significant positive relationship between LGO and identifying a higher number of ambiguous stressors as challenge-related ($\beta = .13, p = .005, B = .13, SE B = .04, sr_i^2 = .32$). However, LGO was not significantly linked with identifying a lower number of ambiguous stressors as hindrance-related ($\beta = -.17, p = .12, B = -.08, SE B = .05, sr_i^2 = -.17$).
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

This thesis sought to advance stress and work-family research by applying the challenge-hindrance stressor framework to work-family outcomes while considering LGO to buffer the impact of the relationship. Contrary to expectations, challenge-related stressors did not positively predict WFE. In fact, results suggest that challenge-related stressors are negatively related to WFE. The result is also inconsistent with prior research that suggests challenge-related stressors predict positive outcomes. Additionally, challenge-related stressors did not significantly predict family-work development. From a theoretical perspective, the results can be explained by COR. Both challenge and hindrance stressors are linked with strain which can exhaust an individual’s resources and result in the inability to meet demands in the work and family domains (LePine et al., 2005), thus limiting possible enrichment. Additionally, individuals experience more intense negative emotional reactions when resources are lost compared to when resources are gained (Hobfoll, 1989). In this thesis, perhaps the negative effects of stressors (e.g., strain) overshadowed any positive, enriching effects challenge-related stressors influence.

The lack of support for hypotheses linked with WFE and family-work development may also be explained by cognitive load theory and cognitive resource theory (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987; Sweller, 1988). The theories suggest that individuals who experience challenging and stressful situations divert their cognitive resources (e.g., intellect and attention) away from necessary tasks. In this thesis, perhaps participants who experienced challenge-related stressors diverted their resources away from demands in work and family domains due to the demands the stressors created, which overshadowed any enrichment challenge-related stressors could have influenced.
This thesis filled some gaps in the literature by identifying relationships between hindrance and challenge-related stressors and work-family outcomes which has not been previously explored. Previously, most prior stress research focused on outcomes solely in the work domain. Additionally, the thesis answered calls to integrate LGO in the challenge-hindrance stressor framework (LePine et al., 2005).

As predicted, challenge-related stressors positively influenced WFC. This finding extends prior research by suggesting that challenge-related stressors may elicit negative outcomes. Contrary to expectations, challenge-related stressors did not predict family-work development and LGO was not a significant link. As mentioned previously, family-work development was the only subscale of FWE. It was hypothesized that refinement of skills and knowledge learned in the family domain would likely be applied successfully to the work domain because one’s ability to transfer learning from one context to the other (Perkins & Soloman, 1992). However, perhaps the skills and knowledge learned in the family domain are not positively transferred to the family domain in regard to helping combat stressors.

Furthermore, the positive link between hindrance-related stressors and WFC was stronger when LGO was higher. This result coincides with basic definitions of LGO and hindrance-related stressors. In general, individuals with LGO are more likely to view stressors as challenging and as situations in which they can overcome in order to increase task competency. However, hindrance-related stressors are stressors known as obstacles that cannot be overcome with increased effort. Someone with the trait of LGO may attempt to continuously overcome a hindrance related stressor that, by definition, cannot be overcome with increase effort. The individual could exhaust all resources in attempt to overcome hindrance-related stressors while influencing WFC in the process.
This thesis also examined the potential relationship between LGO and labeling stressors as challenge-related. The results supported the logic and showed a positive relationship between LGO and labeling stressors as challenging. However, there was not a significant relationship between LGO and labeling stressors as hindering (i.e., the opposite direction of what was hypothesized). This is to be expected due to the lower reliability of the hindrance stressors scale compared to the challenge stressors scale. Therefore, perhaps another, more reliable, scale of hindrance-related stressors should be used.

Furthermore, although most interactions were close to significant levels, most interactions were non-significant. Additionally, the lack of significant findings may reflect the complexity of goal orientation. As mentioned previously, DeShon and Gillespie (2005) stated that the definition of goal orientation is inconsistent in the literature (e.g., sometimes used as a trait, goal, skill). Perhaps the inconsistency of the definition has influenced the construct validity of goal orientation measures, including LGO. Perhaps a similar to construct to LGO, such as self-expansion, should be explored.

Implications

Previous literature has suggested that hindrance-related stressors are positively linked to negative outcomes (e.g., burnout; Cavanaugh et al., 2000) and challenge-related stressors are positively linked to positive outcomes (e.g., motivation; Breevaart & Bakker, 2014; Cavanaugh et al., 2000; LePine et al., 2005). However, this thesis identified that challenge-related stressors may not always influence positive outcomes. This is shown through the positive relationship found between challenge-related stressors and WFC and the unpredicted negative relationship between challenge-related stressors and WFE.

In addition to examining the potential moderating effects of LGO on challenge and hindrance-related stressors’ influence on work-family outcomes, this thesis incorporated LGO’s
influence on labeling stressors as challenge-related. The results extend prior literature by identifying a positive relationship between LGO and labeling stressors as challenging.

Additionally, LePine et al. (2005) suggests that individual characteristics such as LGO may influence challenge and hindrance-related stressors’ influence on various outcomes. The results of this thesis identified that LGO does have a buffering effect on the positive relationship between hindrance-related stressors and WFC.

In the workplace, employers should take note that both positive and negative stressors may be related to negative outcomes. However, some stressors (e.g., challenge-related) may be related to positive outcomes as well (e.g., WFE). Regardless, employers and employees should take note of how work stressors may influence the family domain and how the family domain may influence the work domain.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

While the study had several strengths, it is not without limitations. One item from the conscientiousness scale was omitted due to research error which may have changed the influence of the construct on the outcomes in the study. However, in a recent study examining challenge-hindrance stressors and job outcomes with a moderating role of conscientiousness, Cronbach’s alpha was .83 (Abbas & Raja, 2019). Even with an item omitted, Cronbach’s alpha was .90 in this thesis.

Future research should consider the influence of time in regard to the challenge-hindrance stressor framework. Perhaps a challenge-related stressor is not always viewed as a challenge-related stressor and in fact may turn into a hindrance-related stressor over a period of time. For example, an impending deadline is viewed as a challenge-related stressor (Cavanaugh, 2000). However, what if an individual is continuously given impending deadlines that consistently interfere with their family obligations? Over time, it seems that this challenge stressor could have
hindering effects, especially when considering COR and the JDR model. Additionally, future research should focus on different job types to examine the different effects of challenge and hindrance-related stressors.

As suggested by Peng et al. (2018), work stressors and study outcomes could have reverse effects. In other words, work-family outcomes may influence employees’ experiences of challenge and hindrance-related stressors (e.g., time stressors, job complexity, responsibilities, role overload). Thus, challenge and hindrance-related stressors and work-family outcomes could be reciprocally associated with one another, especially when time is accounted for. According to Spector (2019) the cross-sectional design used in this thesis was appropriate for the variables tested. However, a daily diary study could be useful in determining whether certain stressors are appraised similarly over the course of a few days (e.g., challenge vs. hindrance) and whether stressors in the work domain and stressors in the family domain influence each other reciprocally.

Additionally, the viable use of JDR theory should be considered in regard to the relationship between stressors and work-family outcomes (e.g., are there enough resources given in the work domain for individuals high in LGO to overcome stressors more easily?) JDR may also further explain the reasons as to why challenge-related stressors, generally known to influence positive outcomes, can influence negative outcomes as well (e.g., not enough resources given to an individual for them to overcome the challenge stressor, which could have otherwise been motivating given the proper resources).

Future research should continue to look at individual differences that may impact challenge and hindrance-related stressors’ influence on work-family outcomes. Incorporating individual characteristics such as conscientiousness, positive affect, proactive learning, and other types of goal orientation could be viable. In addition to individual differences, future research
should also look at job characteristics that could buffer challenge and hindrance-related stressors’ influence on work-family outcomes. Peng et al. (2018) found that job autonomy strengthens the negative relationship between hindrance stressors and innovation. Perhaps job autonomy could explain the way in which individuals are able to use resources gained from the family domain and apply those resources to the work domain (e.g., FWE). Additionally, job autonomy may explain the way individuals are able to overcome stressors at work and the way in which individuals are able to meet demands in the family domain.

In regard to LGO, future research could examine the way individuals with low and high LGO cope differently with stressors and how coping strategies could influence work-family outcomes. Additionally, self-efficacy may play a role in whether someone low in LGO is able to combat stressors in the work domain and meet demands from the family domain. For example, someone with low LGO is generally less likely to value challenges and task competency. Perhaps this stems from low self-efficacy (e.g., an individual has developed low LGO due to continuous failure which has created low self-efficacy).

**Conclusion**

This thesis contributes to the literature by examining challenge and hindrance-related stressors’ influence on work-family outcomes while looking at the moderating effects of LGO. The findings suggest several different relationships exist. Two findings suggest that challenge-related stressors may influence WFE and WFC. Additionally, hindrance-related stressors may influence WFC. In regard to individual characteristics, LGO may serve as a buffer for the positive relationship between hindrance-related stressors and WFC and LGO may be linked with assessing more stressors as challenge-related.

The results demonstrate the influence of the challenge-hindrance stressor framework on work-family outcomes. Furthermore, the results suggest that exploring potential individual
characteristics that buffer stressors’ influence on work-family outcomes is a viable direction for future research.
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Appendix A

Prescreen Survey
1. Is MTurk your primary source of employment?
   - Yes
   - No

2. How many hours a week do you currently work?
   1 – 60+

3. Please leave this question blank. Do not click on any response.
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree

4. We are collecting data over multiple surveys, so it is important for us to be able to link your responses between the different surveys. Please enter your mturk worker ID below to proceed:
Prescreen Consent Form: This is a very brief questionnaire that takes only a couple of minutes to complete. Depending upon your response to the survey, you may be eligible to participate in follow-up surveys.

There are no known risks to participating in this study. A potential benefit is that your responses may make you eligible for additional paid survey opportunities. The compensation for this survey is $0.10. The survey contains five questions and will take less than 5 minutes to complete.

We will ask you questions within the study to check that you are paying attention. You must pass the attention check item to receive payment for the study.

Please read the following before agreeing to participate:

1. As a Mechanical Turk user, I agree that I only have one worker account and I will not use automated means to complete the survey.

2. I understand that my Amazon Mechanical Turk Worker ID will only be shared with the researchers listed on the approved IRB application and listed in the informed consent.

3. I have read and understand the privacy policies of Amazon Mechanical Turk found at: https://www.mturk.com/mturk/privacynotice

4. I understand that my participation in the survey is not a form of employment.

5. I understand that the payment for my participation is contingent upon responding to a vast majority of the questions and passing quality check items as noted above.
Your responses and MTurk ID will be automatically compiled in a spreadsheet and remain confidential. All data will be stored in a password protected electronic format. By clicking on the button below you acknowledge that you have read this information and agree to participate in this research. You are free to withdraw your participation at any time without penalty.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me, Danielle Cremeans, at dc81@students.uwf.edu.
Survey Consent Form:

Congratulations! You were identified as eligible to participate in a two-part survey that aims to examine the relationship between stressors that occur in the workplace and work-family issues.

There are no known risks to participating in this study. A potential benefit is that your responses may make you eligible for additional paid survey opportunities. The compensation for this survey is $1.00. The survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

We will ask you questions within the study to check that you are paying attention. You must pass two out of three attention check items to receive payment for the study.

Please read the following before agreeing to participate:

As a Mechanical Turk user, I agree that I only have one worker account and I will not use automated means to complete the survey.

1. I understand that my Amazon Mechanical Turk Worker ID will only be shared with the researchers listed on the approved IRB application and listed in the informed consent.

2. I have read and understand the privacy policies of Amazon Mechanical Turk found at: https://www.mturk.com/mturk/privacynotice

3. I understand that my participation in the survey is not a form of employment.

4. I understand that the payment for my participation is contingent upon responding to a vast majority of the questions and passing quality check items as noted above.

Your responses and MTurk ID will be automatically compiled in a spreadsheet and remain confidential. All data will be stored in a password protected electronic format. By clicking on the
button below you acknowledge that you have read this information and agree to participate in this research. You are free to withdraw your participation at any time without penalty.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me, Danielle Cremeans, at dc81@students.uwf.edu.
Appendix C

Challenge and Hindrance Stressors Measure
Challenge Stressors

The following statements refer to stress in the workplace. Please rate your perception of your work stress regarding the following statements.

1. The number of projects and or assignments I have.
2. The amount of time I spent at work.
3. The volume of work that must be accomplished in the allotted time.
4. Time pressures I experience.
5. The amount of responsibility I have.
6. The scope of responsibility my position entails.

Hindrance Stressors

1. The degree to which politics rather than performance affects organizational decisions.
2. The inability to clearly understand what is expected of me on the job.
3. The amount of red tape I need to go through to get my job done.
4. The lack of job security I have.
5. The degree to which my career seems “stalled.”

Other

1. The amount of time I spend in meetings.
2. The number of phone calls and offices I have during the day.
3. The extent to which my position presents me with conflicting demands.
4. The opportunities for career development I have had.
5. The amount of traveling I must do.
5-point Likert Scale for Challenge and Hindrance Stressors 1 (*produces no stress*) and 5
(*produces a great deal of stress*)

Appendix D

Learning Goal Orientation Measure
Please rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

1. I am willing to select a challenging task/assignment that I can learn a lot from.

2. I often look for opportunities to develop new skills and knowledge.

3. I enjoy challenging and difficult tasks where I’ll learn new skills.

4. I often read materials related to my schoolwork to improve my ability.

5. For me, development of my ability is important enough to take risks.

6. I prefer to work in situations that require a high level of ability and talent.

5-point Likert Scale 1 (strongly disagree) and 5 (strongly agree)


doi:10.1177/0013164497057006009
Appendix E

Work-Family Enrichment Measure
Please rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

My involvement in my work…

Work to family development

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 to be a better family member.
3. Help me acquire skills and this helps me be a better family member.

Work to family affect

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 feel cheerful and this helps me be a better family member.

Work to family capital

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…

Family to work development

10. Helps me gain knowledge and this helps me be a better worker.
11. Helps me acquire skills and this helps me be a better worker.
12. Helps me expand my knowledge of new things and this helps me be a better worker.
5-point Likert Scale 1 *(strongly disagree)* and 5 *(strongly agree)*


Appendix F

Work-Family Conflict Measure
Please rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

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

5-point Likert Scale 1 (strongly disagree) and 5 (strongly agree)

Appendix G

Demographics
2. Please indicate your race/ethnicity, check all that apply:

- Caucasian
- African-American
- Asian
- Hispanic
- Native American
- Other __________

3. What is your age in years?

*Dropdown box 18-60+

4. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Transgender/other _____

5. What is your marital status?

- Now married or living with partner
- Widowed
- Divorced
- Separated
- Never married
- Rather not say
6. How many hours a week do you currently work?
   
   *Dropdown box 0-60+

7. How many hours a week do you work at MTurk?
   
   *Dropdown box 0-60+

8. How many jobs do you currently work?
   
   *Dropdown box 0-9+

9. How many hours a week do you work in a traditional job setting?
   
   *Dropdown box 0-60+

10. Are you currently a student?
    
    - Yes
    - No

11. Are you currently in the military?
    
    - Yes
    - No

12. Have you ever served in the military?
    
    - Yes
13. What is your current job title?

Comment Box

14. What is your highest level of education?

- Less than a high school diploma
- High school diploma
- Some college
- Associate degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- Master’s degree
- Doctoral level degree

15. What is your current job title?

Comment Box

16. How many children under the age 18 do you have living at home with you (e.g., your children or dependents)?

Dropdown box: 0-6+

17. If any, what are their ages?

Comment Box, branches to ages for each child
18. Are you currently assisting an older adult in everyday care?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

19. To what extent are you responsible for the daily care of another adult (e.g., elderly parents)?
   ☐ Not at all
   ☐ Somewhat
   ☐ A good deal
   ☐ Completely
Appendix H
Debriefing Statement
Thank you for your participation in this research study!

The purpose of this survey was to examine the relationship between stressors and work-family issues. Specifically, we are examining how challenge and hindrance-related stressors impact work-family outcomes and how individual characteristics may affect this relationship (if any are found).

If you have any questions about your participation in this study, feel free to contact Danielle Cremeans at dc81@students.uwf.edu.

Additionally, please be on the lookout within the next few days for a shorter version of this survey labeled, "Stressors in the Workplace and Work-Family Issues - Part 2".

Please click the "next" arrow for your MTurk completion code.