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Abstract

Boundary permeability is the degree to which a boundary allows elements from another role domain, such as work, to enter the focal role domain, such as the home. The more extensively work-related elements enter the home domain, the more permeable the home role boundary. Based on a person-situation interactionist perspective, this research builds on prior theoretical and empirical work to better understand how three personal characteristics (home role identity salience, work role identity salience, and polychronicity) and two situational factors (pressure for precedence from the work and home domains) influence the permeability of the home role boundary. Findings from a two-wave employee survey indicate that home role identity salience and polychronicity are indirectly related to home role boundary permeability behavior through permeability preference, and that the relationship between permeability preference and permeability behavior is attenuated by pressure from one’s manager to prioritize work over home.
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Introduction

An increasing representation of dual-earner partners and single parents in the workforce—confronted with extensive demands at work and at home—has fueled considerable research on the work-home interface in recent decades (Allen & Martin, 2017). Research in this area has prompted the need to better understand the process by which employees manage the work-home interface. One construct particularly relevant in this arena is boundary management, the strategies and practices people use to create and maintain their home and work role boundaries (Nippert-Eng, 1996b), the socially-constructed lines of demarcation that define a role, including the times and places in which a role is enacted (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000).

The present study focuses on the management of the home role boundary because of the growing incidence of “work creep” (Milliken & Dunn-Jensen, 2005), in which work crosses the home boundary, gradually encroaching on family and personal time (Powell & Greenhaus, 2006). The proliferation of electronic devices (e.g., cell phones and laptops) has produced increasing expectations that employees stay connected to work during the evening, on weekends, and during vacations (Adkins, Farmville, Premeaux, & Rock, 2014). Moreover, the need to work long hours to “keep up” with peers (Brett & Stroh, 2003) and the presence of long work hours cultures (Burke & Cooper, 2008) further intensify perceptions that employees should engage in work-related tasks even when at home.

The decision to allow work to enter the home domain (or alternatively to leave work at work) involves managing the permeability of the home role boundary.
According to boundary theory, the permeability of a role boundary refers to the degree to which the boundary permits (permeable) or prohibits (impermeable) elements of another role to enter into the focal role (Ashforth et al., 2000).

Managing the permeability of the home role boundary is a critical element of boundary work (Kreiner, Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2009) because boundary permeability has important consequences for employees. A consistently permeable home boundary prevents employees from “disconnecting” or psychologically detaching from work when at home (Sonnentag & Bayer, 2005; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007), inhibiting the recovery process and preventing employees from replenishing the resources depleted at work. Moreover, permeable role boundaries are associated with high levels of role blurring (Matthews, Barnes-Farrell, & Bulger, 2010) and work-family conflict (Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2006; Powell & Greenhaus, 2010), which can impair employee well-being. The aim of the present study is to further our understanding of the personal and situational factors that contribute to the permeability of the home role boundary.

Prior research has focused primarily on personal characteristics as antecedents of boundary permeability. The most widely-studied personal characteristic has arguably been role identity salience (RIS), the subjective importance that a person attaches to each of his or her multiple identities, such as those at work and home (Stryker, 1987; Thoits, 1992). The importance of RIS as a dominant predictor of boundary permeability flows directly from two central tenets of boundary theory. First, because individuals are motivated to enact highly salient roles in other domains (Ashforth et al., 2000), they create permeable boundaries
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around these other domains. Illustrative of this “enactment effect” (Capitano, DiRenzo, Aten, & Greenhaus, 2017), having a highly salient work role identity contributes to a more permeable home boundary (Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2006; Park & Jex, 2011) that permits work-related permeations into the home domain. Second, individuals are also motivated to protect a highly salient role from interruptions from other roles by creating a less permeable boundary around the salient role (Ashforth et al., 2000). Illustrating this “protection effect” (Capitano et al., 2017), having a highly salient home role identity contributes to a less permeable home boundary, resulting in fewer work-related permeations into the home domain (Hecht & Allen, 2009).

Despite the insightful findings from this research, our understanding of the antecedents of boundary permeability is restricted by three important gaps in the literature. First, with few exceptions (Boswell, Olson-Buchanan, & Harris, 2013; Michel, Bosch, & Rexroth, 2014), personal characteristics other than RIS have not been examined as potential antecedents of role boundary permeability. Because individuals participating in a role with a permeable boundary necessarily engage in tasks from multiple roles at the same time, we expect that polychronicity, the preference to simultaneously engage in two or more activities (Bluedorn, Kalliath, Strube, & Martin, 1999; König & Waller, 2010), relates positively to the permeability of the home boundary. Therefore, the present study contributes to the literature by expanding the range of personal antecedents of boundary permeability to include not only work and home RIS (which are role-specific variables) but also polychronicity, a context-free (König & Waller, 2010) variable.
Second, the literature has not examined the mechanism by which personal characteristics influence role boundary permeability. Scholars (Allen, Cho, & Meier, 2014; Kreiner et al., 2009) have distinguished the preferred permeability of a boundary, what we call permeability preference, from the actual permeability of the boundary, what we call permeability behavior. However, with few exceptions (Powell & Greenhaus, 2010), research has not decoupled permeability preference and permeability behavior, nor has it assessed the mediating effect of permeability preference on the relation between personal characteristics and permeability behavior.

As we argue shortly, we believe that personal characteristics, such as RIS and polychronicity, affect the preferred permeability of a boundary, which, in turn, affects permeability behavior. In other words, permeability preference is the proximal outcome of personal characteristics that mediates the effects of RIS and polychronicity on permeability behavior. Therefore, the present study contributes to the boundary management literature by examining in a time-lagged study the mechanism by which employees' personal characteristics influence their boundary management behavior through their preferences.

Third, although several studies have established that situational factors such as workplace norms directly impact permeability behavior (Park, Fritz, & Jex, 2011), prior research has not examined whether situational factors affect the strength of the relation between permeability preference and permeability behavior. This is surprising, given that boundary theory explicitly proposes that strong situational forces weaken the influence of individual preferences on boundary permeability
behavior (Ashforth et al., 2000). Testing this proposition is critical because boundary theory suggests that whether individuals are able to enact their preferred level of boundary permeability may be more important than the actual level of boundary permeability in fostering positive work-family outcomes (Chen, Powell, & Greenhaus, 2009; Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, & Hannum, 2012; Kreiner et al., 2009). Adopting a person-situation interactionist perspective (Bowers, 1973; Buss, 1977), we argue that pressure from the work domain to give precedence to work and pressure from the home domain to give precedence to home represent strong situations (Mischel, 1973) that attenuate the relationship between permeability preference and permeability behavior. Therefore, we contribute to the literature by determining whether strong situational pressures weaken the preference-behavior relationship. Our hypothesized model appears in Figure 1.

----------------------------------------
Insert Figure 1 about here
----------------------------------------

Theory and Hypotheses

Role Identity Salience (RIS) and Preference for Permeability

As noted earlier, scholars have suggested two underlying motivational forces to explain the permeability of role boundaries: enactment and protection (Ashforth et al., 2000; Capitano et al., 2017; Clark, 2000). Because individuals seek opportunities to enact a highly salient role identity in other roles, they are motivated to create permeable boundaries around these other roles so that
activities associated with the highly salient role can permeate the other roles (Ashforth et al., 2000). For example, an engineer with a highly salient work identity may enjoy taking work home and talking about her current work project with family and neighbors, which can only be attained when the home role boundary is sufficiently permeable to allow work-related matters to be brought home. In other words, enactment is the motivating force for a home role boundary to be permeable to work-related elements for those individuals with a highly salient work role identity.

Several studies have demonstrated a positive relationship between work RIS and home boundary permeability behavior (Hecht & Allen, 2009; Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2006; Winkel & Clayton, 2010). However, because enactment represents a motivating force to create permeable boundaries in other roles, we believe the more proximal consequence of RIS is the preference to create a permeable boundary around another role and therefore expect a positive relationship between work RIS and home boundary permeability preference (Capitano et al., 2017).

In addition, individuals want to protect a highly salient domain from extra-domain elements entering the protected domain (Clark, 2000). Therefore, protection is the motivating force to create an impermeable boundary around a highly salient domain, suggesting a negative relation between home RIS and the permeability of the home boundary (Hecht & Allen, 2009). For example, a father who identifies strongly with his home role may want to spend time at home interacting with his spouse and children and performing home-related chores unconstrained by work-related interruptions. Because protection represents a
motivating force to create impermeable boundaries around highly salient roles, we expect a negative relationship between home RIS and home role boundary permeability preference (Capitano et al., 2017).

*Hypothesis 1: Work RIS is positively related to permeability preference of the home role boundary.*

*Hypothesis 2: Home RIS is negatively related to permeability preference of the home role boundary.*

**Polychronicity and Permeability Preference**

Kossek et al. (2012) have emphasized the importance of identifying factors beyond the salience of role identities that influence role boundary permeability. We believe that polychronicity—a general preference for engaging in multiple tasks simultaneously and for alternating or switching tasks within a given period of time (Bluedorn et al., 1999; König & Waller, 2010)—should relate positively to the preferred permeability of a role boundary.

Three specific manifestations of polychronicity are relevant to role boundary permeability preferences. First, polychrons (individuals with high polychronicity) (Kaufman-Scarborough & Lindquist, 1999) prefer to group diverse tasks into the same time period (Bluedorn, Kaufman, & Lane, 1992). Because work-related and home-related tasks are often very different, it is likely that polychrons would feel more comfortable than monochrons (Kaufman-Scarborough & Lindquist, 1999) blending activities from two different domains—work and home—during a given time period, such as the evening or weekend (Kaufman, Lane, & Lindquist, 1991).
Second, polychrons are less partial to scheduling tasks, and if they do schedule tasks, they are more inclined to modify the schedule (by adding, postponing, or deleting tasks) as the day proceeds (Bluedorn et al., 1992). Because polychrons are not likely to have a highly rigid "to do" list of tasks for each day, it is easier for them to incorporate extra-role activities into the day, thereby enhancing their preference for a permeable role boundary. Third, whereas monochrons view unplanned events as an interruption to be "handled" at a planned, later time, polychrons see such unplanned events as a normal part of their day, of equal importance to planned activities (Bluedorn et al., 1992), and are therefore likely to prefer to incorporate unplanned activities into their schedule.

Although researchers have studied polychronicity as a contributor to work-family outcomes (Butts, 2007; Korabik, Rhijn, Ayman, Lero, & Hammer, 2017) or as a predictor of the use of technology to engage in work-related tasks at home (Richardson & Benbunan-Fich, 2011), to our knowledge, research has not yet examined the relationship between polychronicity and boundary permeability preference.

*Hypothesis 3: Polychronicity is positively related to permeability preference of the home role boundary.*

**Permeability Preference and Permeability Behavior**

Hypotheses 1-3 propose that personal characteristics relate to the preferred permeability of the home role boundary. We now suggest that permeability preference relates positively to permeability behavior, that is, the greater the permeability preference, the greater the permeability attained. We note that
although other scholars have distinguished boundary preference from boundary “enactment” (Ammons, 2013; Van Steenbergen, Ybemma, & LaPierre, 2017), we prefer the term permeability behavior because boundary work entails behaviors, practices, and tactics to create and maintain desired boundaries (Ammons, 2013; Kreiner et al., 2009; Nippert-Eng, 1996b); that is, individuals take steps to achieve their preferred permeability of the home boundary (Powell & Greenhaus, 2010).

Nippert-Eng (1996a, b) discusses how individuals who want an impermeable home boundary keep separate calendars for home and work and segment reading material by arranging for delivery of professional magazines to the workplace and personal interest magazines to the home. In contrast, individuals who prefer a permeable home boundary are likely to use technological devices to conduct work-related tasks at home (Adkins et al., 2014; Park & Jex, 2011; Richardson & Benbunan-Fich, 2011). The notion that individuals engage in specific behaviors to achieve a preferred outcome is consistent with research on work motivation (Kanfer, Frese, & Johnson, 2017), risk taking (Sitkin & Pablo, 1992), and proactivity (Bateman & Crant, 1993).

Hypothesis 4: Permeability preference is positively related to permeability behavior of the home role boundary.

Permeability Preference as a Mediator

To gain a fuller understanding of the factors that contribute to the permeability of a boundary, it is important to determine whether permeability preference explains the relation between personal characteristics and permeability behavior. In prior hypotheses, we predicted that personal characteristics relate to
home permeability preference and that home permeability preference relates positively to home permeability behavior. Therefore, we predict that home permeability preference mediates the relationship between personal characteristics—work and home RIS and polychronicity—and home permeability behavior.

*Hypothesis 5a.* Home permeability preference mediates the positive relationship between work RIS and home permeability behavior.

*Hypothesis 5b.* Home permeability preference mediates the negative relationship between home RIS and home permeability behavior.

*Hypothesis 5c.* Home permeability preference mediates the positive relationship between polychronicity and home permeability behavior.

**Situational Pressures from Work and Home**

Adopting a person-situation interactionist view, we examine whether strong situations (Mischel, 1973) influence an individual’s home boundary permeability behavior. Boundary theory posits that strong situations weaken the “influence of individual differences on the creation, maintenance, and crossing of role boundaries” (Ashforth et al., 2000, p. 484). Strong situations, such as after-hours availability expectations (Mellner, 2016), can create a work environment in which individuals perceive pressure to make work a priority over home, and to make the home role boundary permeable to work-related elements regardless of their personal preferences. The impact of strong situations can logically be extended to the home domain, such that a spouse’s expectations, rewards, and punishments may create a home environment in which individuals perceive pressure to make home a
priority over work, and to make the home role boundary impermeable to work-related elements, regardless of their personal preferences. In summary, interpersonal relationships with border-keepers at work and home (Clark, 2000) are important sources of situation strength.

**Work pressure for precedence.** We define work pressure for precedence as the perception that managers expect employees to prioritize work over home demands, signaling that work is more important than home (Kossek, Colquitt, & Noe, 2001). Employees of managers who blend work and home are likely to imitate that behavior, adopting more integrated boundary management behaviors, including highly permeable home role boundaries (Koch & Binnewies, 2014). Additionally, managers may provide employees with electronic devices such as cell phones and laptops, signaling that the employee should bring work home (Richardson & Benbunan-Fich, 2011). Finally, managers may explicitly communicate expectations for a permeable home boundary even if they do not maintain such a boundary for themselves (Hall & Richter, 1988). As employees perceive that their success at work is linked to putting work ahead of home, they are more likely to respond to work-related correspondence, complete work-related tasks, and ruminate over work-related issues while at home. Through example, signals, and explicit communications, managers may pressure employees to prioritize the work role over the home role, with greater pressure promoting greater home boundary permeability behavior.

In addition, in line with Kossek and Lautsch’s (2012) propositions, pressure for precedence of the work role impacts the relationship between employees’ home
permeability preference and home permeability behavior. At low levels of work pressure for precedence, the situation is weak, enabling individuals to behave in accordance with their preferences, producing a stronger relationship between home permeability preference and home permeability behavior. However, high levels of work pressure for precedence represent a strong situation that diminishes individuals’ latitude, producing a weaker relationship between home permeability preference and home permeability behavior. This would be felt most strongly by individuals with a preference for impermeable home boundaries because the pressure is for greater home permeability behavior. In summary, the higher the work pressure for precedence, the higher the permeability of the home boundary and the weaker the relationship between home permeability preference and behavior.

_Hypothesis 6a: Work pressure for precedence is positively related to permeability behavior of the home role boundary._

_Hypothesis 6b: Work pressure for precedence moderates the positive relationship between permeability preference and permeability behavior of the home role boundary, such that the relationship is weaker when work pressure is high than when work pressure is low._

**Home pressure for precedence.** We apply similar theory and logic to hypothesize the direct and moderating effects of home pressure for precedence. We define home pressure for precedence as the perception that a spouse or partner expects the employee to prioritize home over work demands. These expectations are communicated through values, rewards, and norms that signal that home is
more important than work, even to the extent that employees neglect their work responsibilities (Kossek et al., 2001), promoting lower levels of home boundary permeability behavior.

We also expect that home pressure for precedence affects the relationship between employees’ home permeability preference and home permeability behavior. Low levels of home pressure for precedence, perhaps fostered by spouses who support employees’ work activities (King, Mattimore, King, & Adams, 1995), represent a weak situation that enables individuals to behave in accordance with their preferences, producing a stronger relationship between home permeability preference and home permeability behavior. In contrast, high levels of home pressure for precedence represent a strong situation that reduces individuals’ discretion, producing a weaker relationship between home permeability preference and home permeability behavior. This would be felt most strongly by individuals with a preference for permeable home boundaries because the pressure is for less home boundary permeability behavior. In summary, the higher the home pressure for precedence, the lower the permeability of the home boundary and the weaker the relationship between permeability preference and behavior.

*Hypothesis 7a:* Home pressure for precedence is negatively related to permeability behavior of the home role boundary.

*Hypothesis 7b:* Home pressure for precedence moderates the positive relationship between permeability preference and permeability behavior of the home role boundary such that the relationship is weaker when home pressure is high than when home pressure is low.
Moderated Mediation Model

Consistent with a person-situation interactionist perspective, our model traces the path by which personal characteristics affect the permeability of the home role boundary. We propose that work and home RIS and polychronicity are indirectly related to home permeability behavior through home permeability preference, and that these indirect relationships are attenuated in strong situations in which individuals experience pressure for precedence (from work and/or home) to behave in ways regardless of permeability preferences.

Hypothesis 8: The indirect effects of work RIS (8a), home RIS (8b), and polychronicity (8c) on home permeability behavior through home permeability preference are weaker at high as opposed to low levels of work and home pressures for precedence.

Methods

Procedure

This study employed temporally-lagged surveys, Survey 1 and Survey 2, that were linked by a participant-generated identification code. We partnered with a private utility company that agreed to survey all of its non-union employees. Through discussions with organizational executives and employees, we confirmed that all potential participants in the sample were in jobs in which they could bring work home during non-work hours, therefore allowing for at least some permeation of the home role boundary. In addition, none of the potential participants teleworked, thereby assuring that they would have no difficulty distinguishing their work domain and their home domain.
We recruited participants through an email from the CEO to all non-union full-time employees of the organization. At the time of the first data collection (T1), employees were emailed a link to an online survey and asked to create a unique identifying code, enabling us to match surveys while maintaining participant anonymity. At T1, participants completed measures of home RIS, work RIS, polychronicity, home role boundary permeability preference, and demographic characteristics.

Four weeks later (T2), participants completed measures of home and work pressure for precedence and home role boundary permeability behavior. The assessment of permeability preference at T1 and permeability behavior at T2 aligns with the theoretical causal order of these constructs and contributes to the confidence with which causal inferences can be drawn regarding their relationship (Mathieu & Taylor, 2006). In order to reduce common method bias, we implemented the recommendations of Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff (2003) to assure participants of confidentiality in recruitment communications and in the surveys, and by collecting data on permeability preference (mediator) and permeability behavior (outcome) at two points in time (Harrison & McLaughlin, 1993).

Sample

Out of 1,091 employees invited to participate in the study, 555 completed Survey 1, and 505 completed Survey 2. After matching surveys, we were left with 291 employees for a two-survey response rate of 27%. This response rate is in line with other organizational studies using two online surveys and a time lag of three to
twelve weeks (40%, Demerouti, Bakker, & Fried, 2012; 10%, Hurtz & Williams, 2009; 15%, Schermuly & Meyer, 2016; 36%, Sluss, Ployhart, Cobb, & Ashforth, 2012). Because one of our study variables was participants’ perception of home pressure for precedence, which is perceived pressure from one’s spouse or partner, we omitted 58 single participants, leaving a final sample of 233 married/partnered employees.

The average age of the respondents was 48 years, ranging from 23 to 75. The sample was 65% male and 32% female, with 3% not reporting their sex. Most employees (64%) had children living at home. The average tenure with the organization was 12 years. Regarding job level, 42% were hourly employees, 24% were non-management salaried employees, and 34% were managers or executives. There was considerable variation in the highest level of education completed: high school (20%), 2-year college (30%), four-year college (31%), and graduate school (19%).

Measures

Employees answered all items on a 7-point Likert scale (from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 7 = “strongly agree”). All of the final measures had alpha coefficients greater than .70, indicating adequate internal consistency reliability (Nunnally, 1978).

Work role and home role identity saliencies. To assess RIS—the subjective importance that a person attaches to each of his or her multiple identities—we used a shortened version of Kanungo’s (1982) work role involvement scale, and a parallel set of items adapted from Hecht and Allen’s (2009) measure of personal life
identification by substituting the word “home” for “personal” in the applicable items. Sample items are “The most important things that happen to me involve my work” (work RIS) and “I like to be absorbed in my home life most of the time” (home RIS).

After inspection of the home RIS items, we removed the one reverse-coded item to increase the reliability of the scale from .675 to a more acceptable .717. In order for the two identity salience measures to include parallel items, we also removed the reverse-coded item from work RIS scale, which had a small positive impact on its reliability, increasing from .759 to .767.

**Polychronicity.** We assessed polychronicity with the five-item scale (α = .80) created by Slocombe and Bluedorn (1999). A sample item is “I like to juggle several activities at the same time.” The scale’s content adequacy (Bluedorn et al., 1999) and reliability (Conte & Jacobs, 2003) have been demonstrated in prior research.

**Work and home pressures for precedence.** Pressure for precedence is the perception of expectations to place a higher priority on the focal role than other roles. We measured pressures for precedence by adapting the Kossek et al., (2001) six-item climate for sacrifice questionnaire. The original scale was used to assess an individual’s perceptions of climate at work and home. We modified the referent so that it better fit the notion of pressure from a particular person (manager or spouse/partner) as experienced by the respondent. A sample item for work pressure for precedence (α = .90) is “My manager generally expects me to put family second to the job.” A sample item for family pressure for precedence (α = .80) is “My spouse/partner generally expects me to make family our top priority.”
Permeability preference of the home role boundary. Employees assessed their home boundary permeability preference with Kreiner’s (2006) four-item segmentation preference measure (α = .93). Responses to the items were recoded such that higher scores indicate higher levels of permeability preference. A sample item is “I prefer to keep work life at work.”

Permeability behavior of the home role boundary. Employees assessed permeability behavior using Powell and Greenhaus’ (2010) adaption of Kreiner’s (2006) original segmentation preference scale. In their adaption, they removed from each item any reference to preferring or liking to assess what they called “actual segmentation of the work domain from the family domain,” which is conceptually identical to what we call permeability behavior. Again, responses to the items were recoded such that higher scores indicate higher levels of permeability behavior (α = .94). A sample item is “I keep work life at work.”

Demographic information. We measured employee gender and job level because research has found that men are more likely to allow permeations of the home role boundary than women (Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2006; Winkel & Clayton, 2010), and that higher-level jobs are associated with greater permeability of the home role boundary than lower-level jobs (Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2006; Powell & Greenhaus, 2010). Finally, consistent with work on polychronicity (Kaufman et al., 1991), we measured education level due to the potential impact of this variable on permeability outcomes. Other demographic items included were employee age, ages of others living at home, and organizational tenure. After examining the correlations of the demographic variables with the study variables,
we controlled for two demographic variables (age and job level), whose significant relations with both independent and dependent variables could potentially confound the hypothesized relationships. In addition, to be consistent with much of the work-home literature, we also controlled for gender.

Data Analytic Approach

We tested the theoretical model with structural equation modeling using MPlus Version 7.0. We used a two-stage procedure (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988), first assessing the measurement model and then the hypothesized structural model. We estimated several nested structural models, comparing model fit indices, in order to determine the best-fitting final model on which to test our hypotheses. Before testing the measurement and structural models, we mean-centered variables prior to creating interaction terms in order to reduce multicollinearity (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

Results

Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and intercorrelations for the study variables. Notably, participants reported higher levels of home RIS ($M = 5.22$) than work RIS ($M = 3.51$), $t(232) = -14.31, p < .001$. Additionally, they reported higher levels of home pressure for precedence ($M = 4.88$) than work pressure for precedence ($M = 3.37$), $t(232) = -11.29, p < .001$. Participants preferred less extensive home role boundary permeation ($M = 2.72$) than they experienced ($M = 4.85$), $t(232) = -17.94, p < .001$. 

-------------------------------------------

Insert Tables 1, 2, and 3 about here
Consistent with theoretical arguments, the three personal characteristics (work and home RIS and polychronicity) were more strongly correlated with permeability preference than with permeability behavior. Additionally, work pressure for precedence was more strongly correlated with permeability behavior than with permeability preference. The exception to this pattern was home pressure for precedence, which was more strongly correlated with permeability preference than with permeability behavior.

**Measurement Model**

We conducted confirmatory factor analyses to test the factor structure of the model variables (Brown, 2015). We compared $\chi^2$, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), comparative fit index (CFI), and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) of various models. Values for the hypothesized seven-factor model, including home and work RIS, polychronicity, home and work pressures for precedence, home permeability preference, and home permeability behavior, indicated good fit to the data ($\chi^2(303) = 575.09, p \leq .01, \text{RMSEA} = .06, \text{CFI} = .92, \text{SRMR} = .06$) (Hu & Bentler, 1999). As shown in Table 2, we also compared a series of sequential models in which we combined variables into fewer and fewer factors. In summary, all changes in chi-square were statistically significant, providing support for the hypothesized seven-factor model.

**Structural Equation Models**

Given the good fit for the measurement model, we created composites for each of the latent variables and used the composites to test our hypotheses in the structural
model. This composite approach is used to test hypothesized models in which the ratio of sample size to observed variables is not high enough to produce stable estimates of structural relationships (D'Innocenzo, Luciano, Mathieu, Maynard, & Chen, 2016; Powell & Greenhaus, 2010). In this approach, which incorporates the effects of measurement error in indicators, the indicator for each latent construct consisted of the standardized mean of the scale items for the construct, corrected for measurement error by fixing the loading of each indicator to lambda (square root of \( \alpha \)) and setting its error variance equal to theta, the proportion of error variance in the measure \(((1-\alpha)\text{variance of the indicator})\) (Hayduk, 1987). Exogenous variables were allowed to covary freely.

Table 3 summarizes the results of comparisons of nested structural equation models. The hypothesized model had a significantly lower \( \chi^2 \) than the baseline, suggesting a better model fit. Fit indices for the hypothesized model (RMSEA = .04, CFI = .97, SRMR = .04) met suggested standards for good fit. We report unstandardized regression coefficients of the hypothesized relationships in the text below and in Figure 2.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that work RIS would be positively related to permeability preference of the home role boundary. The hypothesis was not supported (\( B = .01, SE = .11, ns \)). Hypothesis 2, which predicted a negative relationship between home RIS and home permeability preference, was supported (\( B = -.44, SE = .11, p < .01 \)). Hypothesis 3, which predicted that polychronicity would be positively related to home permeability preference, was also supported (\( B = .39, SE = .08, p < .01 \)), as was Hypothesis 4, which
predicted a positive relationship between home permeability preference and home permeability behavior ($B = .36, SE = .07, p < .01$).

We tested the proposed mediating effects by examining the significance of the indirect effects using the bootstrapping approach suggested by Preacher, Rucker, and Hayes (2007). Maximum likelihood bootstrapping was used to estimate standard errors and confidence intervals (99%) for the hypothesized relationships (1,000 samples were drawn). Hypothesis 5a predicted an indirect positive relationship between work RIS and home permeability behavior through home permeability preference. The indirect effect was not significant ($B = .01, SE = .04, ns$). Hypothesis 5b predicted an indirect negative relationship between home RIS and home permeability behavior through home permeability preference, which was significant ($B = -.16, SE = .05, p < .01, 99\% CI [-.50, -.02]$). Hypothesis 5c predicted an indirect positive relationship between polychronicity and home permeability behavior through home permeability preference, which was significant ($B = .14, SE = .04, p <.01, 99\% CI [.03,.29]$). Thus, Hypothesis 5 was partially supported.

To gain further understanding of the mediating effects, consistent with Wang, Zhan, McCune, and Truxillo (2011), we also tested three alternate models in which we added direct paths from polychronicity (model 3a), work RIS (model 3b), and home RIS (model 3c), respectively, to home permeability behavior (please see Table 3). Because none of these three models showed significant fit improvement over the hypothesized model and none of the coefficients of the direct paths was significant, our findings indicate that home permeability preference fully mediated relationships of home RIS and polychronicity with home permeability behavior.
Hypotheses 6 and 7 predicted main and moderating effects of work pressure for precedence and home pressure for precedence respectively. Supporting Hypotheses 6a and 6b, work pressure for precedence was positively related to home role permeability behavior \((B = .38, SE = .08, p < .01)\) and moderated the relationship between home permeability preference and home permeability behavior \((B = -.07, SE = .03, p < .01)\). In order to understand the nature of the interaction, we plotted the slopes displayed in Figure 3. Consistent with our prediction, at low levels of work pressure for precedence (one standard deviation below the mean), there was a positive relationship between home permeability preference and home permeability behavior \((b = .42, t = 4.22, p < .001)\). At high levels of work pressure for precedence (one standard deviation above the mean), the relationship between home permeability preference and behavior was significant \((b = .28, t = 2.82, p < .01)\) but weaker, indicating that work pressure for precedence attenuated the relationship between home permeability preference and home permeability behavior.

Home pressure for precedence was positively related to home permeability behavior \((B = .27, SE = .12, p < .05)\), and did not moderate the relationship between home permeability preference and home permeability behavior \((B = .00, SE = .03, ns)\). We note that the positive relationship between home pressure for precedence and home permeability behavior was in the opposite direction than hypothesized, providing no support for Hypothesis 7.
Hypotheses 8a, 8b and 8c predicted that the indirect effects of work RIS, home RIS, and polychronicity respectively on home permeability behavior through home permeability preference would be weaker at high as opposed to low levels of work and home pressures for precedence. We first tested the mediation at one standard deviation below the mean, the mean, and one standard deviation above the mean of work pressure for precedence. The differences in indirect effects at high, average, and low levels of work pressure for precedence were not statistically significant. We repeated the same procedure for home pressure for precedence, finding that the differences in indirect effects at high, average, and low levels of home pressure for precedence were not statistically significant. Thus, Hypothesis 8 was not supported.

The significant effects of control variables in the final model, not shown in Figure 2, were as follows: Sex was related to home permeability preference ($B = -.28, SE = .13, p < .05$), such that men preferred more permeable home boundaries than women, but sex was not related to home permeability behavior ($B = -.02, SE = .14, ns$). Age was positively related to home permeability preference ($B = .02, SE = .01, p < .001$), but not related to home permeability behavior ($B = .00, SE = .01, ns$). Job level was not significantly related to home permeability preference, but was positively related to home permeability behavior, such that the home role boundary of salaried managers was more permeable ($M=5.43, SD=1.23$) than that of salaried non-managers ($M=4.46, SD=1.60$) and hourly employees ($M=4.60, SD=1.63$).

**Discussion**

The findings of the present study provide insights into the personal and situational factors associated with employees’ decisions to permit (or not permit)
work to enter the home domain. We next review our results, highlighting their degree of consistency with prior theory and empirical research, discuss the theoretical and practical implications of our findings, and identify several limitations of the study.

We found, as predicted, that home RIS relates negatively to home permeability preference, providing support for employees’ motivation to protect a highly salient role (home) from boundary permeations by another role (work). This finding supports boundary theory’s proposition that greater home RIS is associated with greater difficulty in role exit, i.e., switching from the home role to work role. It is also consistent with prior research (Hecht & Allen, 2009; Powell & Greenhaus, 2010), suggesting that individuals demonstrate their reluctance to exit a highly salient role, even temporarily (Ashforth et al., 2000), by strengthening the boundary around that role. In contrast, we found no relationship between work RIS and the preferred permeability of the home boundary, failing to support an enactment effect in which employees with a highly salient work role identity prefer a permeable home role boundary so that they can enact their work identity at home.

Why did our results provide stronger support for the protection effect than the enactment effect? One notable difference between the current and previous boundary management studies is the intercorrelation between role identity saliencies. In our study, the correlation between work and home RIS ($r = -.44, p < .01$) is stronger than correlations reported in prior studies ($r = .06, ns$, Winkel & Clayton, 2010; $r = .11, p < .01$, Capitano et al., 2017; $r = -.14, p < .05$, Matthews, et al., 2010; $r = -.25, p < .01$, Park & Jex, 2011). Examination of the correlations of work and
home RIS with home permeability preference (Table 1) shows both are significant (r = .26 and r = -0.43, respectively). Given the strength of the intercorrelation between the two predictors, (Cohen & Cohen, 1983), it is likely the two variables “competed” to explain the variance in permeability preference (Courville & Thompson, 2001) with the stronger effect (protection in our study) winning out over the weaker effect (enactment). Indeed, when we removed home RIS from our model, the results of the SEM (not shown) indicate that work RIS related positively to home permeability preference, which would have supported an enactment effect. This highlights the importance of conservatively including both work RIS and home RIS in boundary management research to avoid the omitted variable bias (Berk, 1983), falsely attributing an outcome to one predictor, when in fact the outcome may be more strongly related to the omitted predictor.

The present study also found that polychronicity was positively related to home permeability preference. This finding is consistent with propositions from the time literature, which suggest that polychronicity, a general disposition for simultaneously engaging in multiple tasks or switching between tasks in a given time period (Bluedorn & Denhardt, 1988; Hall, 1959), should be associated with the preference to engage in activities from different roles within a single time block (Kaufman et al., 1991). It is also consistent with the suggestion of boundary management scholars that global personality characteristics should influence boundary preferences (Kossek, Noe, & DeMarr, 1999). Our results indicate that a broad, context-free disposition (polychronicity) is an additional predictor of home permeability preference along with a role-specific (home RIS) variable.
The findings from our CFA and SEM are consistent with theoretical propositions that permeability preference and permeability behavior are related but distinct constructs. Distinguishing permeability preference and behavior is central to understanding boundary work (Rothbard, Phillips, & Dumas, 2005), which is comprised of strategies and practices individuals proactively use to create and maintain their preferred role boundaries (Nippert-Eng, 1996b). Our finding that home permeability preference fully mediated the relationships of home RIS and polychronicity with home permeability behavior underscores the importance of permeability preference as the linking mechanism that connects personal characteristics with boundary management behavior.

We also examined whether high levels of work and home pressures for precedence represent strong situations (Mischel, 1973) that affect the permeability of the home role boundary. We found that work pressure for precedence was positively related to home permeability behavior, which is consistent with prior studies that have examined other forms of workplace-based social influences to be connected to work after hours (Adkins et al., 2014; Richardson & Benbunan-Fich, 2011). Moreover, our finding that work pressure for precedence weakened the relationship between home permeability preference and home permeability behavior supports boundary theory’s proposition that strong situations restrict the latitude that some individuals have in enacting their preferred role boundaries (Ashforth et al., 2000), and highlights the role of managers as border-keepers (Clark, 2000).
Surprisingly, we found that the more pressure from a spouse or partner to put family first, the more permeable the home boundary. This perplexing finding may indicate that employees faced with strong pressure from the home domain decide that it is preferable to allow work to enter the home domain (and still attend to some home responsibilities) than to remain later at work, thereby being completely absent from home and family activities. Alternatively, it is possible that the causal order of the variables is reversed, such that permeable home boundaries cause spouses to put more pressure on their partners to prioritize home over work, a proposition that can be addressed in future research incorporating longitudinal designs.

**Implications for Theory and Future Research**

Taken as a whole, our findings provide support for a person-situation interactionist perspective (Buss, 1977) on boundary permeability. Personal characteristics, such as the strength of one’s identification with the home role and one’s level of polychronicity, influence one’s home permeability preference, which in turn, relates to home permeability behavior. Decoupling permeability preference from permeability behavior sheds light on the process by which personal characteristics ultimately affect boundary permeability. However, situational pressures from one’s manager to prioritize work over home determine the extent to which an employee is able to enact his or her preferred level of boundary permeability. These findings suggest that theory and research on boundary permeability should incorporate both personal and situational antecedents.
Additional research is required to understand a broader range of personal factors that affect the extent to which employees allow work to enter the home domain. The relation we observed between polychronicity and permeability preference highlights the virtue of adopting a temporal approach to work-home theory and research, which is consistent with the recognition that roles are temporally bounded (Ashforth et al., 2000). For example, research might focus on how people allocate their time each day (or week or year), taking individual differences in time orientation, such as polychronicity (Hall, 1959) and procrastination (Steel, 2007), into consideration as determinants of boundary permeability and time allocation (Gronau, 1976) to work and home, as well as predicting temporal experiences such as flow (Csikszentmihalyi & LeFevre, 1989) as outcomes.

The significant effect of polychronicity on permeability behavior in our study also demonstrates that general dispositional characteristics not linked to specific roles should be included in future research on boundary management. For example, openness to experience, a Big 5 personality characteristic (McCrae & John, 1992), has been found to contribute to work-to-family facilitation (Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004), suggesting that individuals open to new experience are likely to prefer work-related permeations of the home role boundary so that they can transfer skills and behaviors from work to home.

Future research should also gain more insight into the situational factors that enable or constrain employees from enacting their preferred boundary permeability at home. A strong work pressure for precedence is rooted in the
conceptualization of the "ideal worker" as one who “puts work above all else, as reflected in his tireless commitment and dedication to his work” (Ladge, Humberd, Watkins, & Harrington, 2015, p. 153). Our findings suggest organizations that adopt the ideal worker perspective prevent employees who desire an impermeable home boundary from constructing their home role boundary as they prefer, which in turn can have negative effects on employees’ well-being (Chen et al., 2009). To the extent that a strong work pressure for precedence reflects the absence of a family-supportive culture (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999) and family-supportive supervision (Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner, & Hanson, 2008), our findings can help explain why non-supportive cultures and supervisors increase subordinates’ work-family conflict (Kossek, Pichler, Bodner, & Hammer, 2011). That is, a lack of support signals a strong pressure for work precedence, weakening the congruence between preferred and actual boundary permeability for some employees, ultimately intensifying their work-family conflict.

Moreover, there are other situational factors, such as cultural, organizational, and job design characteristics, that may facilitate or diminish the ability to realize one’s preferred level of boundary permeability. For example, the preference-behavior relationship could be examined in contexts of varying cultural norms (e.g., cross-cultural expectations for segmentation and integration), organizational policies (e.g., workplace flexibility practices), and family structures (e.g., presence of young children). Future research might also examine how context influences boundary permeability by comparing objective situational factors (e.g.,
organizational policies) and subjective perceptions of the situation (e.g., perceptions of how policies are regarded) as they affect the preference-behavior relationship.

We note that the present study, like most of the prior research, focused on global or overall role boundary permeability. To advance theory on boundary management, we believe that future research should also examine different forms of boundary permeations (Nippert-Eng, 1996b), such as taking work home (task), thinking about work at home (psychological), discussing work at home (role-referencing), and bringing work-related artifacts home (objects). It is possible that the enactment effect is most strongly related to the preference for role-referencing permeations because talking about a salient role with family and neighbors is intrinsically rewarding and bolsters the self-concept (Ashforth et al., 2000), whereas the protection effect is most strongly related to the preference to avoid task-related permeations because engaging in job tasks may require exiting the home role. Similarly, the strength of the relationship between role boundary permeability preference and behavior may be stronger for forms of permeation over which one has more control, such as talking about work at home (role-referencing permeation) than for other forms of permeation over which one has less control, such as actually performing work at home (task permeation).

Finally, although it was beyond the scope of this study, future research should examine personal and situational antecedents of the permeability of the work role boundary. Such research should provide a more comprehensive understanding of boundary management by identifying the similarities and differences in the processes that determine the extent to which employees bring their work home and bring their home responsibilities into the workplace.
Implications for Practice

The findings of this study have important practical implications for individual contributors, managers, and organizations. Employees striving to balance work and home (De Hauw & Greenhaus, 2015) would benefit from identifying their own home role boundary permeability preferences as a first step in taking a proactive approach to their careers through building self-awareness (Hall, 2004). Managers should recognize that employees’ behavior (e.g., working from home, responsiveness to email off-hours) is not necessarily indicative of their true boundary preferences, which should help the managers understand how their employees prefer to manage their multiple life roles. Moreover, when jobs require frequent work from home, hiring managers might incorporate this information into employment interviews and encourage job applicants to consider whether their personal characteristics (e.g., polychronicity) provide a fit with the requirements of the job.

Ultimately, organizations should try to use their insights into employee boundary preferences to develop more options rather seeking the one “best” policy regarding work and home. For example, organizations could develop work-from-home practices and provide greater technology connectivity for employees who prefer more permeable home role boundaries, while also developing a “no email during off-work hours” option for employees who prefer less permeable home role boundaries.

Limitations
The implications of our findings for theory, research, and practice should be qualified in light of several study limitations. Our results may have been affected by common method and common source biases (Podsakoff et al., 2003). To mitigate these concerns, we assured participants of anonymity, temporally separated the measurement of key variables, and used validated measures comprising simple, specific, and concise items (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Additionally, the interaction of work pressure for precedence and permeability preference was unlikely to be affected by common method bias (Evans, 1985). Nevertheless, it is preferable to incorporate data from multiple sources utilizing multiple measurement techniques.

Second, our hypotheses imply causality, which are better tested using longitudinal or experimental designs. For example, studies examining the causal path from individual characteristics through permeability preference to permeability behavior could measure variables over multiple points in time to determine whether changes in individual characteristics (e.g., RIS) are related to changes in role boundary permeability preference and behavior. Additionally, our sample was derived from one firm in a single industry, and to examine parallel perceptions of pressures for precedence from managers and spouses/partners, the sample was limited to cohabitating couples, both of which may limit the generalizability of the findings.

Conclusion

Boundary theory has important implications for how we understand the work-home interface (Ashforth et al., 2000). Because permeability is a key characteristic of role boundaries, our research examined the complex paths predicting home role boundary permeability. Taking a person-situation
interactionist perspective, we found that a role-related characteristic (home RIS) and a context-free characteristic (polychronicity) both influence home boundary permeability preference, that people work to realize their home boundary preference, and that situational pressures to prioritize work over home can weaken the relationship between permeability preference and permeability behavior.
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Table 1  
*Correlations and Descriptive Statistics*  
| Variable                          | Mean  | S.D.  | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. T1 Sex\(^a\)                  | 0.33  | .47   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 2. T1 Job status\(^b\)           | 1.91  | .87   | -.16*| .20**|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 3. T1 Age                         | 47.60 | 10.95 | -.05|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 4. T1 Work RIS\(^c\)             | 3.51  | 1.13  | -.03| -.02| -.08| .77 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 5. T1 Home RIS\(^c\)             | 5.22  | 1.03  | -.04| -.05| .44**| .72 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 6. T1 Polychronicity              | 4.04  | 1.16  | .13 | .30**| .04 | .12 | -.22**| .80 |     |     |     |     |     |
| 7. T2 Pressure for precedence-W\(^d\) | 3.37 | 1.65  | -.13| -.03| -.15*| .12 | -.15*| .01 | .90 |     |     |     |     |
| 8. T2 Pressure for precedence-H\(^e\) | 4.88 | 1.45  | -.18**| .13 | -.21**| -.01 | .16*| .00 | .14*| .80 |     |     |     |
| 9. T1 Permeability preference     | 2.72  | 1.37  | -.04| .11 | .26**| .26**| -.43**| .38**| -.04| -.24**| .93 |     |     |
| 10. T2 Permeability behavior      | 4.85  | 1.55  | -.16*| .22**| -.03| .22**| -.17*| .19**| .34**| .18**| .24**| .94 |     |

N = 233; T1 = Time 1; T2 = Time 2  
\(^a\) Male = 0, Female = 1  
\(^b\) Hourly = 1; Non-management salaried = 2; Manager/Executive = 3  
\(^c\) RIS = Role Identity Salience  
\(^d\) W = Work  
\(^e\) H = Home  

* p < .05 (2-tailed)  
** p < .01 (2-tailed)
Table 2

Model Fit Results for Confirmatory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$ ($\Delta$ df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized 7-factor model</td>
<td>575.09**</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-factor model (combining home and work identity salience)</td>
<td>672.63**</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>97.54(6)</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-factor model (combining home and work pressure for precedence)</td>
<td>971.73**</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>299.10(5)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-factor model (combining identity salience and polychronicity)</td>
<td>1307.79**</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>366.06(4)</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-factor model (combining all first-stage variables)</td>
<td>1532.75**</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>224.96(3)</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-factor model (separating home permeability behavior)</td>
<td>2014.63**</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>481.88(2)</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-factor model</td>
<td>2824.01**</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>809.38(1)</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=233. All alternative models were compared to hypothesized 7-factor model. All $\chi^2$ differences are significant at p<.01. CFI=comparative fit index. RMSEA=root mean squared error of approximation. SMRM=standardized root mean square residual.
Table 3

Comparisons of Nested Structural Equation Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$ ($\Delta$ df)</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Baseline model</td>
<td>368.02</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Hypothesized model</td>
<td>33.59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>380.18 (42)**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a: Model 2 with direct effect from polychronicity</td>
<td>33.53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.06 (1)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b: Model 2 with direct effect from work identity</td>
<td>31.64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.95 (1)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c: Model 2 with direct effect from home identity</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.45 (1)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 233$

RMSEA = root mean square of approximation

CFI = comparative fit index

SRMR = standardized root mean square residual
Figure 1. Hypothesized Model

Note: Hypothesis 5 (mediation) and Hypotheses 8 (moderated mediation) are not shown in Figure 1.
Figure 2. Final Structural Model

Note: Numbers in parentheses are standard errors. *p<.05 **p<.01
Highlights

- Polychronicity, a domain-free individual characteristic, predicts preference for boundary permeability.
- Permeability preference mediates the relationship between individual characteristics and permeability behavior.
- Situational pressures restrict the ability to achieve desired boundary permeability.
- Examining both role identity saliencies in work-home interface research reduces omitted variable bias.

Figure 3. Interaction of Pressure for Precedence from Work and Permeability Preference