AN EXAMINATION OF RELATIONS BETWEEN DAILY WORK-NONWORK

BOUNDARY STRENGTH, DAILY EVENTS AND EMOTIONS

Onn-anong Ngamwattana

A Thesis

In

The John Molson School of Business

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master of Science in Administration (Management) at

Concordia University

Montreal, Quebec, Canada

April 2012

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Onn-anong Ngamwattana

Entitled: An examination of relations between daily work-nonwork boundary strength, daily events and emotions

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
                        Master of Science in Administration (Management)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final examining committee:

_____ Chair
         Dr. Muhammad Jamal   Examiner
         Dr. Linda Dyer   Examiner
         Dr.Tracy D. Hecht   Supervisor

Approved by   _____
                       Chair of Department or Graduate Program Director

                       _____
                       Dean of Faculty

Date   _____

ABSTRACT

An examination of relations between daily work-nonwork boundary strength, daily events and emotions

Onn-anong Ngamwattana

As individuals engage in multiple social roles (e.g. employee and parent), an understanding of how individuals manage and maintain boundaries between roles has become critical. To respond to this issue, this research focuses on boundary strength (at work and at home) by examining the relations between boundary strength in one domain and daily events in the other and the relations between boundary strength and daily emotions. A 7-day diary study was conducted; data were collected from a sample of 102 employed parents. Consistent with hypotheses, boundary strength in one domain was weaker on days when negative events occurred in the other. In contrast to predictions, boundary strength at home was found to be weaker, rather than stronger, on days when positive work events occurred. No support was found for relations between boundary strength at work and positive nonwork events. In line with hypotheses, negative correlations were found between boundary strengths (at work and at home) and negative emotions and a positive correlation was found between boundary strength at work and positive emotions, although significant results were not found for all days. No support was found for relations between boundary strength at home and positive emotions. The findings open avenues for research to further investigate antecedents of boundary strength, as well as the link between daily emotions and boundary strength. The findings also provide further support for the cross-domain relations between individuals' work and personal lives.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to my supervisor for your understanding, support, and guidance through every step. Thank you to Erika and Zheni, the coders, for your help with the coding process. Thank you to the committee and every staff at the John Molson School of Business who helped me getting through the process and giving me advice. Thanks to my friends for giving me encouragement and reminding me, that life with a thesis is not only about misery but also fun.

Thank you to my parents who provide me support in every way. Dad and Mom, you are the best and I am so thankful for being born in this lovely family. Thanks to my lovely sister for being a model of strength. Thank you most of all to Hugo for always being there for me and tolerating my mood swings. I appreciate all of your effort for encouraging me not to give up and making me smile during this whole process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The increasing overlap between work and nonwork domains has made it difficult for individuals to manage multiple life roles, to achieve balance between roles, and to reduce conflicts that stem from multiple role participation. At the same time, there has been a renewal of research on work-nonwork boundaries, and boundary management (e.g. Ahsforth, Kreiner, and Fugate, 2000; Bulger, Hoffman, and Matthews, 2007; Clark, 2000; Golden and Geisler, 2007; Hall and Ricther, 1988; Hecht and Allen, 2009; Nippert-Eng, 1996, etc). Knowledge of work-nonwork boundaries may have important implications for understanding relations between work and nonwork roles, such as how the overlap between domains can affect individual and organizational effectiveness. From a scholarly perspective, however, there is still much that can be learned. The purpose of this research is to respond to this issue. It looks at how daily boundary strength in one domain is related to daily events in the other domain and how daily boundary strengths at work and at home are related to daily emotions. This study makes both theoretical and practical contributions. It explores daily boundary strength in relation to daily events and emotions—two factors that individuals experience on a regular basis. Practically, this should expand our knowledge of work-nonwork boundaries in terms of its expected antecedents, and consequences, and the cross-domain relations between work and nonwork. It also increases our knowledge of individuals' daily experiences managing work-nonwork boundaries. Additionally, organization may apply this knowledge to design effective work-family initiatives to aid their employees in understanding relations between work and nonwork domains and to train their employees how to manage work-nonwork boundaries more effectively, which can enhance outcomes not only for individuals and their overall well-being but also for organizations.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF RESEARCH ON THE WORK-NONWORK INTERFACE

For decades, scholars have been interested in examining the relations between work and nonwork domains (e.g. Edwards and Rothbard, 2000; Ford, Heinen, and Langkamer, 2007; Kabanoff, 1980; Lambert,1990; Meissmer, 1971; Near, Rice, and Hunt, 1980). The process by which work and nonwork interact has been explained by numerous models, including segmentation, compensation, spillover, work-family conflict (WFC), and work-family enrichment. According to a segmentation framework, "work and nonwork lives are separate spheres of life, either because they are inherently independent or because workers actively keep them that way" (Lambert, 1990, p. 241). The compensation model argues that when individuals are not satisfied with one domain, they may try to seek satisfaction (i.e. compensate) in another domain (Lambert, 1990). The spillover model proposes that skills, attitudes, behaviours, and emotions experienced in one domain can be transferred to another domain, resulting in similar reactions in both domains (Crouter, 1984; Grzywacz, 2000; Hecht and Allen, 2009). The work-family conflict framework (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985, p. 77) argues that participation in one role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in another role.", whereas the work-family enrichment framework (Greenhaus and Powell, 2006) proposes that positive experiences in one role can enhance positive outcomes in another role through a transfer of resources.

This study fits in with the spillover model. The reason is that spillover provides a reasonable explanation of how boundaries in one domain can become stronger or weaker on days when events in another domain occur—through a transfer/spillover of positive or negative emotions from one domain to another domain. Accordingly, I propose that on days when negative events occur in one domain, boundary strength in another domain will be weaker than on days when no such events occur. I suspect that a

weakening of boundary strength in one domain can occur through negative emotional spillover. I also propose that on days when positive events occur in one domain, boundary strength in another domain will be stronger than on days when no such events occur. A strengthening of boundary in one domain can occur through positive emotional spillover. Detailed explanations of these ideas follow in later sections.

BOUNDARY STRENGTH

Ashforth, Kreiner, and Fugate's (2000) boundary and micro role transition theory is a framework that highlights the important implications of boundary strength. This framework explains how individuals manage and negotiate boundaries between their work and nonwork roles in order to achieve balance and reduce conflicts between domains. The theory focuses on the social roles that individuals hold in different settings and how individuals engage and disengage themselves (psychologically and/or physically) from different roles through boundary-crossing activities (Ashforth et al., 2000).

According to this theory, boundaries refer to "the physical, temporal, emotional, cognitive, and/or relational limits that define entities as separate from one another" (Ashforth et al., 2000, p. 474). Boundaries serve to demarcate which role should be salient, allow individuals to concentrate on enacting a current role, and limit the intrusions of other roles (Ashforth et al., 2000). Individuals create boundaries to organize their environments (Ashforth et al., 2000), to help achieve balance and minimize conflicts that may stem from occupying multiple roles. The process of boundary creation and maintenance includes how strong boundaries are, which can influence outcomes of the interaction between domains (Bulger et al., 2007).

Boundaries are composed of two aspects—flexibility and permeability (Ashforth et al., 2000). When boundaries between roles are flexible, a person can switch from one role to another role at any place and/or anytime (Ashforth et al., 2000). For example, an employee with a flexible work-role boundary can change his/her work schedule to meet nonwork demands (e.g., to attend his/her child's school plays). A role with permeable boundaries is one that allows a person to psychologically and/or behaviourally engage in other roles while enacting a current role (Ashforth et al., 2000). For example, an employee with a permeable work-role boundary may think about his/her sick child while having a meeting at the office.

Flexibility and permeability of boundaries between roles also reflect the extent to which individuals segment or integrate their social roles—so called role segmentation and role integration. When a person has low flexibility and/or permeability of boundaries between roles, it is said that h/she segments his/her social roles and therefore has strong boundaries (Ashforth et al., 2000). In this case, the individual makes a distinction about which role should be salient in a given setting (Ashforth et al., 2000). For example, individuals who deal with, and concentrate on, only work-related issues at work and only on personal-related matters outside the office are said to have role segmentation and strong boundaries. The clear spatial and temporal markers associated with strong boundaries facilitate the psychological process of identity compartmentalization by allowing role occupants to focus on a single role in a given setting and prevent the distraction that may incur from cross-role interruptions (Ashforth et al., 2000). Accordingly, individuals with strong boundaries may experience less interrole conflict between domains. Kossek, Lautsch,& Eaton (2006) conducted a study on telecommuting, control, and boundary management and found support for this notion. They found that individuals with role segmentation (i.e. strong boundaries) were less

likely to experience family-to-work conflict than did those with role integration (i.e. weak boundaries.).

When boundaries between roles are highly flexible and/or permeable, it is referred to as role integration. When roles are highly integrated, a person makes no distinction between his/her work and personal lives, and therefore has weak boundaries. High flexibility and/or permeability of boundaries between roles complicate the process of boundary maintenance and management because individuals may be confused about when and where work and nonwork responsibilities are carried out (Hall and Richter, 1988) and these types of boundaries increase the possibility that other roles will intrude on a current role. Research has found that weak boundaries between roles are related to various negative outcomes for individuals including decreased employee well-being, more interference between work and nonwork roles, and exacerbation of work-life conflicts (e.g. Brannen, 2005; Bulger, et al., 2007; Chesley, 2005; Hammer, Neal, Newsom, Brockwood,& Colton, 2005; Kossek, et al., 2006; Olson-Buchanan& Boswell, 2006; Raghuram& Wiesenfeld, 2004; Williams& Alliger, 1994).

Overall, boundary strength is defined as the extent to which a person segments or integrates his/her social roles—work and nonwork—on a continuum from segmentation to integration (Ashforth et al., 2000). Researchers agree that complete role segmentation and complete role integration are rare (Ashforth et al., 2000; Clark, 2000; Nippert-Eng, 1995; Rau & Hyland, 2002). For the majority of individuals, boundary strength lies between highly segmented and highly integrated roles (Ashforth et al., 2000; Clark 2000). Although flexibility and permeability are two aspects of boundaries, permeability has received more research attention; and is a core representation of the concept of boundary strength (e.g. Golden and Geisler, 2007; Hecht and Allen, 2009). For this reason, it is the focus of the current study.

It is also important to note that the construct of boundary strength is bi-directional, (see Bulger, Hoffman, & Matthews, 2007; Hecht& Allen, 2009; Olson-Buchanan, & Boswell, 2006). The bi-directional nature of work-nonwork boundary strength refers to "the extent to which work and nonwork permeate each other depends on whether one is talking about spillover of work to nonwork or vice versa" (Hecht& Allen, 2009, p. 841). In other words, individuals' boundary strength at work may not be at the same extent as their boundary strength at home. For example, a manager may have strong boundaries at work but weak boundaries at home. In that case, the extent to which nonwork spills over to work is lower than the extent to which work spills over to nonwork. Accordingly, it is important that boundary strength at work and at home be examined separately.

Antecedents of Boundary Strength

To date, limited research has investigated antecedents of boundary strength and its focus has been on role identification. For example, in work-family border theory, Clark (2000) argued that individuals themselves place the personal meaning of self in each role. Identity theory (Burke, 1991) also recognizes this notion suggesting that the core of an identity is the categorization of the self as an occupant of a role, and the incorporation, into the self, of the meanings and expectations associated with that role and its performance (Stets, & Burke, 2000). This implies that a person behaves according to the meaning of self h/she places in each role. Accordingly, a person may develop strong or weak boundaries between work and nonwork roles in association with role identification (e.g., a person who strongly identifies him/herself with a work role may develop a strong boundary at work but weak boundary at home by allowing work-related matters to intrude on a nonwork domain).

There are some empirical studies to support this notion. For example, direct evidence was found in Hecht and Allen's longitudinal study of the work-nonwork boundary strength construct (2009). Hecht and Allen (2009) proposed role identification as an antecedent of boundary strength, arguing that strong role identification should be related to strong boundaries around the domain of a given role. Their reasoning was that strong identification with a given role should allow individuals to absorb themselves into the role and prevent intrusions from other roles. Consistent with this, they found that job identification was a positive predictor of boundary strength at work. Likewise, Olson-Buchanan& Boswell (2006) found that work role identification predicted the degree to which work permeated nonwork and increased work role-referencing at home, whereas nonwork role identification predicted the degree to which nonwork permeated work and nonwork role-referencing at work. Their results, therefore, are in line with Hecht& Allen's (2009), suggesting that role identification is, indeed, a potential antecedent of boundary strength at work and at home.

Although role identification may influence the extent to which individuals have strong or weak boundaries between roles, in general, individuals still enact each role in a specific context each day. Ashforth et al. (2000) highlighted the importance of situational context in their boundary and micro role transition theory. Ashforth et al. (2000) argued that "social domains and local contexts may strongly influence the creation, maintenance, and crossing of role boundaries and the nature of role identities within them" (p. 484). Similarly, in the work-family border theory, Clark (2000, p. 748) suggested that although "people shape their environments; they are, in turn, shaped by them."

In addition, past research has recognized that boundaries are enacted daily. For example, Ashforth et al. (2000) suggested that holding multiple social roles, individuals

enact boundaries daily by engaging and disengaging themselves from one role to another through boundary-crossing activities. They discussed how individuals enact the role of parent every morning and shift to a work role later in the day. Similarly, Hall and Richter (1988, p. 215) also noted that "individuals make transitions through boundary crossing between work and home roles daily". Considering this, it seems reasonable to suggest that the situational contexts in which roles are enacted on a daily basis may be associated with the extent to which a person develops and maintains boundary strength at work and at home. To expand our knowledge on this issue, it seems warranted to examine how situational contexts that occur in one domain are related to boundary strength in the other. The current study proposes that daily events in one domain (e.g. nonwork) are situational contexts that may be related to boundary strength in the other domain (e.g. work).

The Nature of Events

For the purpose of this study, an event is defined as something that does not happen every day. Some events are relatively rare (e.g., being on vacation, making a mistake at work, etc); others are more common (e.g. getting support with childcare, having extra tasks to do at work, etc). Following past research (e.g. Oishi, Diener, Choi, Kim-Prieto, and Choi, 2007; Zautra and Simon, 1979), this study investigates events in terms of their valence (i.e. negative and positive), and the domain in which they occurred (i.e. work and nonwork domains).

Negative events refer to events that have "the potential or actual ability to create adverse outcomes for the individual" (Taylor, 1991, p. 67). Negative events include major negative events and minor or daily negative events. Major negative events refer to "events that require a significant or major life adjustment" (cited by Pillow, Zautra, and

Sandler, 1996, p. 381) such as divorce or death of family member. Daily or minor negative events (minor stressors) refer to events that lead to "stress as immediately experienced in the day-to-day lives of individuals" (Wagner, Compas, and Howell, 1988, p. 190) such as having arguments with one's spouse, receiving negative comments from a supervisor, and so on. Common minor or daily negative events are often referred to as hassles, which are defined as "events that irritate, annoy, or upset us or can cause problems, pressures, or difficulties for us" (Compas, Davis, Forsythe, & Wagner, 1987, p.535). Negative events are widely recognized as a stressor for individuals (e.g. Cohan&Bradbury, 1997; Cohen, Tyrrel& Smith, 1993; Langston, 1994; Nolen-Hoeksema, Parker& Larson, 1994). Studies in diverse literatures agree that negative events tax individuals' cognitive, emotional, and/or behavioural resources (Gross et al., 2011; Taylor, 1991), drive feelings (Tesser& Beach, 1998), limit individuals' focus on the situation (Folkman& Moskowitz, 2000; Fredrickson, 2001; Taylor, 1991), and may cause people to neglect demands in other domains (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Nolen-Hoeksema et al, 2000). In this study, the term "negative work events" is used to refer to negative events at work and the term "negative nonwork events" is used to refer to negative events at home or outside work.

Positive events refer to events that bring pleasurable experiences to an individual. Like negative events, positive events also include major events, which require major life adjustment (e.g. being promoted at work), and daily/minor events (e.g. celebrating a birthday party). A common form of minor or daily positive events are uplifts, which are "positive experiences such as the joy derived from manifestation of love, relief at hearing good news, the pleasure of good night's rest, and so on" (Kanner et al., 1981, p. 6). There is evidence that positive events have positive outcomes on individuals' over all well-being such as decreasing depressive symptoms (e.g. Lewinsohn and Graf, 1973;

Nezlek and Gable, 2001), increasing positive emotions (e.g Gable et al., 2000) and improving mental health (e.g. Zautra and Simons, 1979). The current research uses the term "positive work events" to refer to positive events at work and "positive nonwork events" to refer to positive events at home or outside work.

Past research has recognized events as the proximal stimuli of affective reactions, such as emotions or changes of moods (Gross, Semmer, Meier,Kälin, Jacobshagen, & Tschan, 2011). Indeed, ample evidence has been found in diverse literatures which shows that positive events are strongly associated with positive emotions, whereas negative events are strongly associated with negative emotions (e.g. Clark& Watson, 1988; David, Green, Martin,& Suls, 1997; Eck, Nicolson,& Berkhof, 1998;Gable Reis,& Elliot., 2000; Lazarus, 1991; Suh, Deiner,& Fujita, 1996; Tesser& Beach, 1998; Zautra and Simon, 1979). Particularly, when a person experiences negative events during the day, h/she feels more negative, compared to days with no such event. For example, Eck, Nicolson, and Berkhof (1998) conducted a study to examine the relation between negative daily/minor events and mood levels among 85 white-collar workers for 5 days and found that subject's negative affect increased after they experienced stressful daily events. Similarly, Affleck, Tennen, Urrows, and Higgins (1994) found that subjects' negative moods increased on days when stressful events occurred. Similarly, research has also demonstrated that positive events evoke positive affect (e.g. Gable et al., 2000) and that individuals' positive emotions increase on days when they experience positive events (e.g. Zautra, Reich,& Guarnaccia, 1990).

The Relations between Events and Boundary Strength

As discussed earlier, past research has recognized that work and nonwork domains are interconnected and affect one another (e.g., Clark, 2000; Crouter, 1984;

Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux,& Brinley, 2005; Greenhaus& Beutell, 1985; Greenhaus& Powell, 2006; Grzywacz, Almeida,& McDonald, 2002; Grzywacz& Bass, 2003; Kossek& Ozeki, 1998; Wayne, Randel,& Stevens, 2006; Williams& Alliger, 1994; Williams, Suls, Alliger, Learner,& Wan, 1991). Accordingly, when individuals experience events at work or at home, the effects of these events may not be limited to the domain in which the events occur but may also spill over to other domains. This section incorporates a spillover theory to help to explain how events in one domain can be related to boundary strength in the other.

Spillover Theory

When a person carries over emotions, behaviour, attitudes, and/or skills from one domain (e.g. work) to another (e.g. nonwork) and this results in a similar reactions in the two domains, it is commonly referred to as spillover (e.g. Crouter, 1984; Edwards& Rothbard, 2000; Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair,& Shafiro, 2005; Hecht and Allen, 2009). The construct of spillover is multidimensional (e.g. Allen, Herst, Bruck,& Sutton, 2000; Barnett& Hyde, 2001; Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne,& Grzywacz, 2006; Edwards& Rothbard, 2000; Greenhaus& Powell, 2006; Grzywacz et al., 2002; Grzywacz& Marks, 2000; Hecht& Boies, 2009).

The most common forms of spillover found in research are emotional and behavioural (Hecht& Boies, 2009). Both emotional and behavioural spillovers have two components—positive and negative. Positive behavioural spillover refers to skills, attitudes, or behaviours acquired in one role/domain being put to use in other settings (Crouter, 1984). For example, a teacher using teaching skills acquired from his/her professional role to help his/her own child at home. Negative behavioural spillover occurs when individuals use behaviours, attitudes and/or skills from one role that are

inappropriate with his/her current role. For example, a manager acts bossy with his/her spouse, which may be inappropriate in a spousal role.

Positive emotional spillover refers to a transfer of positive energy, moods, or feelings from one domain to another. For example, a working mother who is happy to know that her son wins the gold medal in his karate class carries the positive mood experienced in her personal life to the office. Negative emotional spillover, on the other hand, refers to a transfer of negative energy, moods, or feelings from one role/domain to another. For example, a manager getting frustrated with an unexpected, but urgent, meeting at work comes home and transfers the frustration from work to his/her spouse. Research has found that both positive emotional and behavioural spillovers can have positive outcomes for individuals' well-being, work behaviours and attitudes (Hecht& Boies, 2009), whereas negative emotional or behavioural spillover can have negative outcomes, such as work-family conflict, interference and work/family stress (e.g., Grzywacz, et al., 2002).

Relations between Negative Events and Boundary Strength

From a spillover perspective, negative emotions triggered by negative events can lead to negative emotional spillover (Grzywacz et al., 2002). Negative emotions from one domain have been associated with negative emotions, behaviours, as well as decreased role performance and rewards in another (e.g. Edwards,& Rothbard, 2000; Schulz, Cowan&Cowan,&Brennan, 2004). For example, Thompson, Kirk,& Brown (2005) conducted a study to examine a spillover of work stress to the family environment among policewomen and found that negative mood (stress) from the work role reduced performance and participation in the family role (less family cohesion with family members). In a similar vein, a strain-based conflict model proposed by Greenhaus &

Beutell (1985) also provides the explanation for this linkage, such that strain in one role, through a spillover of negative affect (e.g., fatigue, depression, anxiety, etc) makes it difficult to fulfill requirements or performance of another role (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). In this sense, strain invoked by negative events in one role also affects experiences or performance in another.

Considering that negative emotions triggered by negative events in one domain can spillover into other domains, it seems reasonable to suggest that this reflects a weakening of boundaries between domains. For example, consider a manager who arrives at the office with frustration due to an unsolved argument with his/her spouse. In this case, the manager has negative emotional spillover since h/she carries the frustration from his/her personal life to work. Accordingly, h/she transfers his/her negative emotions from a spousal role to a work role and thinks about the argument with his/her spouse while being at work. In this case, his/her boundary strength at work is weaker than a regular day when there is no such event. Similarly, a manager may transfer feelings of anxiety from work due to an unsolved case with a company's major customer and h/she may think about the case while h/she is at home. In this case, his/her boundary strength at home is weaker than a regular day when h/she does not face any negative work-related events. The association between negative events and negative emotions implies that negative events may trigger negative emotions on days when negative events occur. As noted earlier, these negative emotions may spillover to other domains. Through this negative emotional spillover, boundary strength in one domain may be weaker on days when negative events occur as compared to days with no such events. This leads to the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: On days when negative work events occur, boundary strength at home is weaker than on days when no such events occur.

Hypothesis 2: On days when negative nonwork events occur, boundary strength at work is weaker than on days when no such events occur.

Hypothesis 3: Negative emotions are negatively related to boundary strength at work (H3a) and at home (H3b). The more negative emotions a person experiences, the weaker their boundaries at work (H3a) and at home (H3b).

<u>Relations between Positive Events and Boundary Strength</u>

The same mechanisms described above can also be used to explain how positive events in one domain can be related to boundary strength in another and how positive emotions can be associated with boundary strength in both domains. As noted earlier, research has found that positive events are strongly associated with positive emotions, and that individuals positive emotions increase on days when positive events occur as compared to days with no such events (e.g. Zautra, Reich,& Guarnaccia, 1990). Positive emotions invoked by positive events in one domain can affect individuals' functioning, performance, rewards, and experiences in the other.

Prior research agrees that positive emotions enhance social interactions, as well as individuals' resources and functions in both a current role and other roles (e.g. Fredrickson, 1998; Folkman& Moskowitz, 2000; Fredrickson& Losada, 2005; Gable et al., 2000; Staw, Sutton,& Pelled, 1994). Unlike negative events, however, positive events in one domain (e.g. work) may actually lead to a strengthening, rather than a weakening, of boundary strength in the other domain (e.g. nonwork). This supposition can be explained by work-family enrichment framework.

Greenhaus & Powell (2006, p. 73) proposed a theory of work-family enrichment, which is defined as "the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of

life in the other role". They proposed that one role can enhance positive outcomes (e.g. well-being, performance, positive emotions, etc.) in another role through a transfer of resources (skills and perspectives, psychological and physical resources, social-capital resources, flexibility, and material resources). They argued that the extent to which resource gains generated in one role promote performance, engagement or positive affect in another can occur through two paths—an instrumental path or an affective path (Greenhaus and Powell, 2006; Wayne et al., 2006).

The instrumental path in the work-family enrichment model is similar to positive behavioural spillover, in which resources such as skills, perspectives, or behaviours acquired in one role promote performance or engagement in another (Greenhaus& Powell, 2006). Likewise, the affective path is similar to positive emotional spillover, in which resources, psychological resources in particular, in one domain produces positive affect within that domain which in turn improves individual functioning, performance, or engagement in the other domain (Wayne et al., 2006). Incorporating a work-family enrichment model with positive emotional spillover, it seems reasonable to suggest that positive emotions generated by positive events in one domain can enhance individuals' functioning and role engagement—role absorption—in another domain, which may reflect a strengthening of boundary strength at work or at home.

This reasoning can be supported by Rothbard's (2001) study on the effects of multiple role engagement. Rothbard (2001, p. 656) suggested that one of the main components of role engagement is absorption, which refers to "being engrossed in a role ...and the intensity of one's focus on a role". When individuals are absorbed in a given role, they focus only on that role which they are currently enacting (Rothbard, 2001). Being absorbed in a given role may also mean that interruptions from other roles are less likely to occur (Rothbard, 2001). Thus, when individuals are absorbed in one role,

they tend to have strong boundaries around that role. Rothbard (2001) further suggested that individuals with positive emotional responses from one role would increase their engagement/absorption in other roles (Rothbard, 2001). Based on a survey of 790 employees working at a large public university, she found that positive affect experienced from the family domain was significantly and positively associated with absorption in work roles. Drawing on these results, it is possible that on days when positive events in one domain occur, individuals feel more positive as compared to days with no such event. These positive emotions may generate resources that enhance absorption in roles and limit intrusions of the other roles. Accordingly, positive emotions may be associated with stronger boundaries at work and at home and this may be reflected in a strengthening of boundaries in one domain on days when positive events occur in the other. This leads to the next set of hypotheses:

Hypothesis 4: On days when positive work events occur, boundary strength at home is stronger than on days when no such events occur.

Hypothesis 5: On days when positive nonwork events occur, boundary strength at work is stronger than on days when no such events occur.

Hypothesis 6: Positive emotions are positively related to boundary strength at work (H6a) and at home (H6b). The more positive emotions a person experiences, the stronger their boundaries at work (H6a) and at home (H6b).

METHOD

Sample

Employed parents from day-care centers and schools on the Island of Montreal were recruited. The total number of 104 parents returned completed surveys, but 2 participants were excluded from the analyses because they did not meet the criteria of being working parents (one was on maternity leave and the other was a full-time student). This yielded the final number of 102 participants. The majority of participants were female (63.5%), with an average age of 39 years old. The majority of participants lived with their spouse (or partner) and their children (84.6%). Other participants lived with their spouse or partner (4.8%), with their children as a single parent (4.8%) or other living arrangements with other dependents—e.g. father- and mother-in-law (3.8%). Of the participants, 40.4% had two children, 35.6% had one child, and 20.2% had three children. In total, 40% had two children living at home, 36% had one child living at home, 19% had three children living at home, 3% had four children living at home, and 2% did not report this information. The most common age for the youngest child living at home was four years old (14.4%), with an average age for the youngest child being 5 years old. Of the participants, 6.7% had other dependents (e.g. aging parents).

Participants had diverse educational backgrounds, including graduate degrees (36.5%), undergraduate degrees (31.7%), CEGEP or trade school diplomas (10.6%), some university (8.7%), and some graduate studies (5.8%). The range of household income included over $100,000 (39.4%), $50,001-$75,000 (19.2%), and $75,001-$100,000 (17.3%). The majority of participants work full-time (76.9%), with an average working hours per week of 35.6. The majority of participants worked at the company office (76.9%), with an average of 7.6 years working with their current organization. Most

participants worked in small (2-100 employees; 34.6%) and large (over 1000 employees) organizations (30.8%). Participants worked in educational services (21.2%); health care (including pharmaceutical) and social assistance (12.5%), professional, scientific, and technical services (12.6%); finance and insurance (5.8%), manufacturing (4.9%); retail and wholesale trade (3.8%); administration and support (2.9%); information and cultural industries (2.9%), and construction (1%) among others.

Procedure

This study used data from a larger study of work-life balance, which attempted to capture individuals' day-to-day experiences of the work-life interface. Participants were recruited from 8 sites including 4 daycares, 3 elementary schools, and 1 high school. At two daycares, packages with two diaries were distributed in each child's cubby and parents were invited to send back the completed diaries in postage paid return envelopes. At one daycare and the three elementary schools, paper letters were distributed to parents and interested parents were asked to contact the researchers if they wanted to participate. At one daycare and the high school, an e-mail was sent to parents with information about the study and interested parents were asked to contact the researchers if they wanted to participate.

Participants received a diary to complete for about 10 days, which they could begin at their convenience. They were instructed that if they missed a day for any reason, they could continue the following day. The diary had 3 parts. The first part asked participants for background demographic and work characteristics (5-7 minutes to complete). The second part asked participants for their day-to-day work-life balance experiences (5 minutes/night) for 7 days. They were instructed to complete the second part each night before they went to bed. They were also instructed to avoid looking at

their previous responses and were reminded to note the date and time each day. The same questions were repeated every day (7 days). The third part of the diary asked participants for their general experiences (e.g., overall health, work characteristics, typical interactions between work and nonwork). Participants were instructed that the third part of the diary could be completed all at once or one section at a time (total time 20-25 minutes). Participants were then asked to return the completed diary with a postage-paid envelope. Each participant was compensated with a $50 gift card after the envelope with completed diary was returned. Participation was voluntary and each participant was assured of confidentiality. All diaries were completed in English.

Measures

Demographic Characteristics. Information on demographic characteristics, including gender, age, current living arrangements, number of children or dependents living with participants, level of education, and range of household income was collected in Section 1 of participants' diaries. Information on work characteristics, including job title, employment status (full-time vs. part-time), average working hours per week, primary location of work, job and organizational tenure, size of the organization, industry, and work-family policies and practices available at their work place (and whether or not they had used such practices) were also collected in the first section of the diary.

Boundary strength at work and boundary strength at home were assessed using a 14-item modified version of scales validated by Hecht & Allen (2009). Boundary strength was measured in the second section of the diary, which asked participants to respond to the same set of questions about their day-to-day work-life balance experiences for 7 days. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they integrate their work and personal lives on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 4 (all day, all the time). The section began

with Today… and was followed by boundary strength at home and at work items, respectively. Boundary strength at home included items such as "I did work at home", "I used technology to do work-related activities at home or outside the office", and "I was absorbed in thought about work while at home". Boundary strength at work included items such as "I engaged in nonwork activities at my workplace", "I talked about my life with my coworkers, boss, and/or clients", and "I was preoccupied by personal matters while at work". Cronbach's Alpha was used to test for the internal consistency reliability of the scales. For boundary strength at home, the average Cronbach's Alpha across all days was 0.83. For boundary strength at work, the average Cronbach's Alpha across all days was 0.77.

Daily Emotions were measured using items drawn from the PANAS-X scale (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988) and the self-relevant emotions identified by (Tangney, 2003). The list of positive emotions contained 7 items including happy, alert, confident, bold, proud, strong, and calm. The list of negative emotions contained 9 items including tired, afraid, angry, sad, disgusted, angry at myself, guilty, ashamed, and dissatisfied with myself. Participants were asked to rate from 1 (very slightly or not at all) to 5 (extremely) how they felt at the end of each day. For negative emotions, the average Cronbach's Alpha across all days was 0.77. For positive emotions, the average Cronbach's Alpha across all days was 0.87.

Positive and Negative Events. Daily events were assessed through open comments written by participants in section 2 of their diaries at the end of each day (7 days). Following the closed-ended questions, participants were asked to provide comments about their day—"Please tell us more about today's "work-life balance" experience and how you felt at the end of the day". These open comments were coded by two independent coders, as described in the results section. After the coding was done, each

person received a score for positive work events, negative work events, positive nonwork events, and negative nonwork events for each day that they completed the diary. Participants received a score of 1 if they commented that a particular type of event occurred on a given day and 0 if it did not

For Section 1 of the diary, at the beginning of each day, participants were asked to record the date and time when they completed their daily diary. This allowed us to track if data pertained to a weekday or weekend. The same questions were repeated every day for seven days. It is important to note here that because the purpose of the current study is to investigate the interaction between work and nonwork domains; I only included data from weekdays and excluded data from weekends. I chose to do this because participants had to manage their work and nonwork roles simultaneously during the weekdays whereas only nonwork roles are prominent during the weekends because of the days off from work.

RESULTS

Coding of Positive and Negative Events

The researcher and her supervisor developed a list of negative and positive events to use in the coding process. First, the researcher and her supervisor independently reviewed each participant's comments. Second, the researcher and supervisor conducted a literature review of past research that measured positive and negative events. After a thorough review, and careful discussions between the researcher and supervisor, three scales that were most relevant to the current study were chosen. The three scales were the original hassles and uplift scales (Kanner, Coyne, Schaefer, and Lazarus 1981), the police daily hassles and uplift scales (Hart,

Wearing, and Headey, 1993), and the interpersonal hassles and uplifts scales (Maybery and Graham, 2001). From these three scales and participants' comments, the researcher generated a list of events that was divided into work events (108 events) and nonwork events (146 events).

After a discussion between the researcher and supervisor, the list of events was divided into four categories—negative work events, positive work events, negative nonwork events, and positive nonwork events. The reason for adding the distinction between positive and negative events was to make the coding scheme more concrete for the coders. The researcher and her supervisor then reviewed the list to narrow it down from 254 events and ensure that only relevant items were retained on the list. The researcher and her supervisor did this independently and then discussed their choices to generate the final list of events. We omitted events that were not relevant to the current study (e.g., problems on job due to being a woman or man, rising prices of common goods, etc). In addition, some events from existing scales were vague and lacked specificity (Pett and Johnson, 2005). To address this problem, we added domain specificity (work or nonwork) to some of the original items. For example, the item "Completing a task" was turned into two items: "Completing a work task" and "Completing a task at home". Finally, we added events that were described by numerous participants but were not found on any of the existing scales (e.g. "Approaching work deadline", "Missing work deadline", and "Not having to do homework with children").

The final list of events contained 78 events—20 positive nonwork events, 32 negative nonwork events, 11 positive work events, and 15 negative work events. For each category, "other event" options were added. We decided to add this option for the coders in case they felt that participants reported an event that did not match any of the

categories provided on the coding scheme (see Appendix A for the coding instruction and final list of events).

There were four steps involved in the coding process. First, the researcher met with both coders to provide an overview of the current study and explain the coding process. Printed instructions, along with a coding scheme, were given to each coder at the first meeting. In order to familiarise the coders with the coding process, a sample of comments from 10 participants was sent via email to the coders after the first meeting. The coders were asked to read those participants' comments and decide if each comment described any events; if so, the coders were asked to code every event that was reflected in the comment (i.e. from 1 to 78). Critically, each comment could refer to more than one event. For example, one participant commented that "my work deadlines are tight and I am not spending enough quality time with my family". This comment reflected the experience of a negative work event (i.e. approaching work deadline) and negative nonwork event (i.e. not spending enough time with family). Coders were asked to assign both relevant codes. If the coders felt that a written comment did not describe any event, they were asked to leave the coding area blank for that day.

After the researcher received the emails with completed coding from both coders, the researcher and supervisor had a meeting to review and discuss the coding results. From the 70 sample comments (total of 280 possible codes), there were 66 discrepancies that pertained to 47 comments. Of the discrepancies, 64 pertained to a situation in which one coder coded an event (s) whereas the other coder did not and 2 pertained to a situation in which the coders agreed that an event had occurred, but disagreed as to the specific code for the event. The researcher and her supervisor reviewed all of the codes and came to a consensus as to which codes were appropriate.

Then, a second meeting with the coders was arranged and the researcher provided feedback derived from the meeting with her supervisor to the coders.

After debriefing at the second meeting, the coders were asked to recode the 10 sample participants. There remained 26 discrepancies pertaining to 21 comments, a reduction of more than 60%. There were 20 discrepancies in which one coder coded an event whereas the other did not. There were also 6 discrepancies in which coders coded an event in the same category but with a different code. For example, one participant commented that: "I was a little tired at work because it was very busy. When I reached home, I had a lot of housework waiting since I chose not to do any the night before. Spent the evening cleaning, laundry, dishes because five year old is having a sleepover." Both coders coded an event in the same category - in this case, negative nonwork event, but one coded 42 (having extra tasks to do at home), whereas the other coded 52 (other negative nonwork events).

At this point, the researcher provided the coders a complete list of all comments and asked them to complete the coding process. After 14 days, the researcher received the files back from the coders. The researcher and supervisor reviewed the files and calculated the percentage of agreement. The percentage was calculated based on whether participants experienced (yes = 1) or did not experience (no = 0) events in each category—positive work event, negative work event, positive nonwork event, and negative nonwork event. There were 707 comments for a total of 2828 possible codes. It is important to note here that we did not ask participants to report on events; therefore, the comments included many other topics. For example, one participant commented: "It's Friday! It was relaxing at work. I did not feel anything weird. I was rather happy for my plans on the weekend. I guess I was thinking about other stuff at work. Nevertheless, I was excited to finish this day. At home, we had a family dinner. Everyone was there. I

was happy!" Of 707 comments, the coders agreed on codes for all four categories on 491 comments and 216 comments contained discrepancies.

The next step was to arrange an open discussion between the two coders in order to resolve as many discrepancies as possible. With the researcher present, the coders were asked to go through each discrepancy and explain their positions to each other (i.e. why they coded an event or not). Once the coders explained their positions, the researcher asked if either one wanted to change her code. If one coder agreed to make a change, this was noted. Following the open discussion, discrepancies in 200 comments were resolved and 16 comments still contained discrepancies. The researcher and her supervisor resolved these remaining discrepancies. Each reviewed and coded the comments separately; then a meeting was arranged to review and discuss the final 16 comments. Agreement was obtained in all cases during these discussions. At this point in the coding process, another diary was received. The researcher and supervisor decided to include this diary in the data set and they coded its comments, increasing the total number of comments to 714.

Of the final 102 participants, 22 participants had no events and 80 participants reported experiencing at least one event. Of the 80, 57 reported more than one event per day. For example, one participant commented, "My work was okay. I am learning new things and that makes me happy. However, one of my sons was sad when I left him in the daycare and sometimes, because I am tired, it is hard to be at work and work without thinking about my family." This comment reflected two events with one being a positive work event (Learning new skills and/or doing something new at work) and the other being a negative nonwork event (Child being upset when you went to work). Thirty-two participants experienced negative events at work and 18 participants

experienced positive events at work. Sixty-eight participants experienced negative nonwork events and 60 participants experienced positive nonwork events.

Of the 15 negative work events from the coding list, 9 were mentioned by participants. Frequencies of reported negative work events appear in Table 1. As shown, events that were reported the most were "approaching deadline at work", "problems at work", and "skipping lunch or taking a shortened lunch break." Of the 11 positive work events on the coding list, 7 were reported by at least one participant (see Table 2). Positive work events that were most mentioned were "completing a work task", "company event or department get-together (including lunch with colleagues)", and "gaining new skills and/or doing something new at work."

Of the 32 negative nonwork events, 29 were reported by participants (see Table 3). The most frequently reported negative nonwork events were "issues related to planning or preparing meals (including grocery shopping)", "family member being sick or injured", and "being sick or injured." Of 20 positive nonwork events, 19 were reported by at least one participant (see Table 4). Positive nonwork events that were mentioned the most included "socializing with friends," "engaging in exercise or recreation," "being on vacation/having a day off from work," and "celebrating a birthday, holiday, or special event with family."

Table 1 Frequencies of Reported Negative Work Events

Negative Work Events	Number of times that negative work events were reported/coded
Approaching deadline at work	12
Problems at work	11
Skipping lunch or taking a shortened lunch break	9
Having extra tasks to do at work	8
Changes or uncertainty at work (e.g. reorganization)	8
Problems with employees, co-workers, clients, supervisor or employer	3
Not receiving support from your supervisor or employer	3
Not completing a task at work	3
Receiving distressing communication at work	1

Table 2 Frequencies of Reported Positive Work Events

Positive Work Events	Number of times that positive work events were reported/coded
Completing a work task	11
Company event or departmental get-together (including lunch with colleagues)	4
Gaining new skills and/or doing something new at work	3
Having a success on work task or project	2
Boss pleased with your work	1
Starting a work task that has been pending	1
Other work-uplifts events	1

Table 3 Frequencies of Reported Negative Nonwork Events

Negative Nonwork Events	Number of times that negative nonwork events were reported/coded
Issues related to planning or preparing meals (including grocery shopping)	32
Family member being sick or injured	31
Being sick or injured	21
Taking/driving child to sports practice/extracurricular activity	20
Doctor's appointment for self or family member	17
Not getting enough rest or sleep	13
Errands and messages to do	13
Not enough time with family	12
Other nonwork-hassles events	10
Having to wait for an appointment or service	5
Child being upset when you went to work	5
Getting (or worried about getting) flu/H1N1 shot with family	5
Having a problem with your child	4
Hassles from ex-spouse	4
Being stuck in unusually bad traffic	4
Having extra tasks to do at home	4
Death of friend or acquaintance	3
Having a problem with childcare or child's school	3
Issue related to care of pet	3
Being late for pick-up or drop-off at child's daycare	3
Having an argument or conflicts with your spouse/partner	2
Partner being out of town	2
Unspecified/other personal or family problem	2
Child is away (or planning to go away) from home	2
Attending a funeral	1
Missing a child's school or extracurricular activity	1
Problem at nonwork activity	1
Transportation problems	1
Received distressing communication from family or friend	1

Table 4 Frequencies of Reported Positive Nonwork Events

Positive Nonwork Events	Number of times that positive nonwork events were reported/coded
Socializing with friends	20
Engaging in exercise or recreation	18
Being on vacation/having a day off from work	18
Celebrating a birthday, holiday, or special event with family	16
Receiving support from friends or family (including help with childcare)	16
Attending a child's school or extracurricular activity	15
Eating out	12
Enjoying children's accomplishment	9
Spending extra time with family	9
Having extra/enough time for myself	8
Attending a movie, concert, or other entertainment event	6
Getting extra/enough sleep or rest	5
Health of family member improving	4
Making vacation plans	4
Doing volunteer work or contributing to a charity	3
Giving support to family or friends	3
Other nonwork-uplifts events	2
Completing a task at home	1
Not having to do homework with children	1

Creation of Event Scores

Four variables were created from the event data: negative work events, positive work events, negative nonwork events, and positive nonwork events. Individuals were assigned codes for each day in each category depending on whether or not they experienced that type of event. The event data was inputted as "0" if the person did not report that type of event on that day and "1" if they did report that type of event on that day. For each participant, the 4 columns of categories of events were repeated for the 7 days of the diary.

For work events, there were about 100 people with a score for no event; 25 people with a score for negative events only; 14 people with a score for positive events only; and only two people with a score for both positive and negative events. For nonwork events, about 95 people had a score for no events; 50 people had a score for negative events only; and 25 people had a score for both negative and positive events. Because there were only two people who had a score for 'both positive and negative work events,' we decided to exclude that category from the analyses.

The next step was to create scores for events. Data for different weekdays was combined so that each person had only one score for all 4 variables (boundary strength at work, boundary strength at home, positive emotions, and negative emotions) under 7 different situations (no work event, negative work events only, positive work events only, no nonwork event, negative nonwork events only, positive nonwork events only, both negative and positive nonwork events). To do this, averages were calculated for each participant in the different situations. For example, participant ID 100 had positive nonwork events on Monday and Thursday, and negative nonwork events on Wednesday. She had positive work events on Tuesday and Friday. Scores for boundary

strength at home and at work, and positive and negative emotions, were calculated for this person by averaging her data on each variable from Monday and Thursday. This data was inputted for the category of positive nonwork events. Scores for each of the four variables on Wednesday were inputted in the category of negative nonwork events. Scores for each of the four variables were averaged for Thursday and Friday and inputted into the category of no nonwork event. This person had no score for the category of both positive and negative nonwork events because she had no days when both types of events had occurred. For work events, an average for all variables was calculated from the average of Tuesday and Friday, and this was inputted into the category of positive work events. An average for each of the four variables on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday was inputted into the category of no work events. This person had no score for either negative work events or both positive and negative work events because she did not have any days when these types of events had occurred.

The same procedure was followed for each person, with averages being calculated based each individual's reporting of different types of events. It is worth noting that some people did not complete the diary over seven consecutive days and had data for certain days of the week twice (e.g., completed the diary on two Mondays). In those cases, data for duplicate days were averaged prior to other transformations, so that each person started with only one score for Monday, one score for Tuesday, and so on, for each of the four variables.

The data was then ready for the analysis and the final step was to choose the statistical method to assess the hypotheses. In order to assess how events in people's lives (in one domain—e.g. nonwork) are related to boundary strength in another (e.g. work; Hypotheses 1, 2, 4, and 5), we decided to compare the mean of boundary strength on days when subjects had no event to the mean of boundary strength on days when

subjects had events (either positive, negative, or both positive and negative events). Because participants' boundary strengths were repeatedly measured over time (during the weekdays) under different conditions (no events, positive events, negative events, and both positive and negative events), the standard ANOVA could not be used and Linear Mixed Models (LMM) were, appropriate. LMMs were also appropriate (rather than repeated measures ANOVA) because participants did not necessarily have scores for all four conditions.

LMM is a multi-step procedure in which different models are compared to assess the best fit. First, the data are analyzed as if they do not have repeated measures (Model 1). Second, the data are analyzed with a repeated subcommand (Model 2). This model accounts for repeated measures but assumes that all individuals start at the same baseline level of dependent variables when they have no event. The last model (Model 3) included both repeated and random subcommands. This model accounts for repeated measures, but does not assume that everyone starts at the same baseline on the dependent variables when they have no event.

LMM also allows for choices regarding the covariance structure of the (repeated measures) dependent variables. We chose Autoregressive (1) or AR1 for the covariance structure; this means that measures of the dependent variables are correlated with one another over time but correlations should decrease as the time between measures increases. AR1 also assumes that the variance in dependent variables is the same everyday. However, there was an exception for one analysis (i.e., negative emotions with work events), in which we used ARH1 instead of AR1 for the covariance structure. ARH1 makes the same assumptions about correlations over time, but it allows for variance of the dependent variables to vary on different days. In other words, AR1

assumes that variance in the dependent variable is the same for all types of days, but ARH1 allows it to be different.

To compare the three models and know which model was the best fit, the values of the -2 log likelihood are compared; the significance of the difference follows a chi-square distribution. As noted earlier, the category of "both positive and negative work events was excluded because there were only two people who had scores in that category. Thus, the LMMs for work events included only 3 repeated measures, rather than 4. Maximum likelihood (ML) was used for all models.

Results for Model Comparisons

Results for model comparisons are presented in Tables 5 and 6. As shown, there were 6 out of 8 cases where Model 3 was the best fit and 2 cases where Models 2 and 3 are not significantly different than one another. It is important to note here that for all the cases, Model 2 is better than Model 1. Therefore, the supervisor and researcher decided to interpret the results of Model 3 (both repeated and random subcommands) for all analyses.

Table 5 Model comparisons for Boundary Strength at Work/at Home and Events

Analysis	Model	-2 log likelihood (df)	$\Delta\chi^2$ to previous model
Boundary Strength at Home and Work Events	*1 (no repeated measures)*	*300.55 (4)*	*--*
	2 (repeated measures)	*279.37 (5)*	*21.18**
	3 (repeated measures and random baseline)	*275.42 (6)*	*3.94**
Boundary Strength at Home and Nonwork Events	*1 (no repeated measures)*	*453.92 (5)*	*--*
	2 (repeated measures)	*372.38 (6)*	*81.54****
	3 (repeated measures and random baseline)	*359.606 (7)*	*12.77****
Boundary Strength at Work and Work Events	*1 (no repeated measures)*	*166.39 (4)*	*--*
	2 (repeated measures)	*149.65 (5)*	*16.47****
	3 (repeated measures and random baseline)	*139.47 (6)*	*10.18***
Boundary Strength at Work and Nonwork Events	*1 (no repeated measures)*	*283.49 (5)*	*--*
	2 (repeated measures)	*252.27 (6)*	*31.22****
	3 (repeated measures and random baseline)	*240.79 (7)*	*11.48****

Note. * p < .05. ** p < .01 *** p < .001

Table 6 Model comparisons for Positive/Negative Emotions and Events

Analysis	Model	-2 log likelihood (df)	Δχ² to previous model
Positive Emotions and Work Events	1 (no repeated measures)	309.77 (4)	--
	2 (repeated measures)	281.58 (5)	28.19***
	3 (repeated measures and random baseline)	281.25 (6)	0.34
Positive Emotions and Nonwork Events	1 (no repeated measures)	432.72 (5)	--
	2 (repeated measures)	383.66 (6)	49.06***
	3 (repeated measures and random baseline)	373.83 (7)	9.83**
Negative Emotions and Work Events	1 (no repeated measures)	131.06 (4)	--
	2 (repeated measures)	68.54 (7)	62.53***
	3 (repeated measures and random baseline)	67.88 (8)	0.66
Negative Emotions and Nonwork Events	1 (no repeated measures)	224.99 (5)	--
	2 (repeated measures)	201.65 (6)	23.35***
	3 (repeated measures and random baseline)	179.35 (10)	22.3***

*Note. * p < .05. ** p < .01 *** p < .001*

Hypothesis 1 stated that *on days when negative work events occur, boundary strength at home will be weaker than on days when no such events occur;* Hypothesis 4 stated that *on days when positive work events occur, boundary strength at home will be stronger than on days when no such events occur.* These hypotheses were tested in one LMM *(see Table 7).* The results indicated that work events, overall, were marginally related to participants' boundary strength at home (F [2, 39.85] = 3.17; *p < .10).* We examined the post-hoc pairwise comparisons even though the overall effect was marginal because our specific hypotheses were about those comparisons. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, participants' boundary strength at home was marginally weaker on days when they experienced negative events at work than on days with no events at work (see Table 7). Accordingly, Hypothesis 1 was partially supported. Contrary to Hypothesis 4, participants' boundary strength at home was weaker on days when they experienced positive events at work than on days when no work events occurred. Interestingly, there was no difference between participants' boundary strength at home on days when they had negative events at work as compared to days when they had positive events at work.

Table 7 Means for Boundary Strength at Home under Different Work Event Conditions

and Results of Post-Hoc Comparisons from LMM analysis (Model 3)

	No Work Event	Negative Work Events	Positive Work Events
Boundary Strength at Home	3.25[a, b]	3.04[a]	3.03[b]

Note. Means with the same superscript differ at p < .10. Comparisons were done using Least Significant

Difference (LSD).

Hypothesis 2 stated that _on days when negative nonwork events occur, boundary strength at work will be weaker than on days when no such events occur._ Hypothesis 5 stated that _on days when positive nonwork events occur, boundary strength at work will be stronger than on days when no such events occur._ Similar to Hypotheses 1 and 4, these hypotheses were also tested in one LMM _(see Table 8)._ The results indicate that nonwork events, overall, were not related to participants' boundary strength at work. Nonetheless, we examined the post-hoc pairwise comparisons because our specific hypotheses were about those comparisons. Consistent with Hypothesis 2, participants' boundary strength at work was weaker on days when they experienced negative nonwork events than on days when they had no nonwork events (_see Table 8_). Accordingly, Hypothesis 2 was supported. Hypothesis 5 was not supported because there was no statistically significant difference between participants' boundary strength at work on days when they had no nonwork events as compared to days when they experienced positive nonwork events. There was no difference in participants' boundary strength at work on days when they had no nonwork events as compared to days when they experienced both positive and negative nonwork events. However, participants' boundary strength at work on days when they experienced negative nonwork events was marginally weaker than participants' boundary strength at work on days when they experienced positive nonwork events (see Table 8).

Table 8 Means for Boundary Strength at Work Under Different Nonwork Event

Conditions and Results of Post-Hoc Comparisons from LMM analysis (Model 3)

	No Nonwork Event	Negative Nonwork Events	Positive Nonwork Events	Both Positive and Negative Nonwork Events
Boundary Strength at Work	3.37^a	$3.24^{a, b}$	3.36^b	3.33

Note. Means with the superscript a differ at p < .05; means with the superscript b differ at p < .10.

Comparisons were done using Least Significant Difference (LSD).

Hypothesis 3 stated that *negative emotions are negatively related to boundary strength at work (H3a) and at home (H3b). The more negative emotions a person experiences, the weaker his or her boundaries at work and at home;* Hypothesis 6 stated that *positive emotions are positively related to boundary strength at work (H6a) and at home (H6b). The more positive emotions a person experiences, the stronger his or her boundaries at work and at home.* These hypotheses were tested separately for each weekday with Pearson Correlation. Correlations were done separately for each weekday because including data from all days in single correlation would have violated the assumption of independences. By testing these hypotheses separately for each weekday, we avoided this problem. We looked at the overall pattern of results across the 5 days to determine if the hypotheses were supported (Table 9).

As shown in Table 9, a significant negative correlation between negative emotions and boundary strength at home was observed on 3 out of 5 days (Monday, Tuesday, and Friday). On the remaining days (Wednesday and Thursday), the correlation was not significant but was in the predicted direction (negative). A significant (negative) correlation between negative emotions and boundary strength at work was observed on 2 out of 5 days (Wednesday and Thursday). Likewise, on the remaining days, the correlation was not significant but was in the predicted direction (negative). This, therefore, provides partial support for Hypotheses 3a and 3b.

There was no significant correlation found between positive emotions and boundary strength at home for any weekday. Hypothesis 6b is, therefore, not supported. For the relation between boundary strength at work and positive emotions (*H6a*), a

significant positive correlation was observed on 3 out of 5 days (Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday). This, therefore, provides partial support for Hypothesis 6a.

Table 9 Correlations between Boundary Strength and Emotions

	Monday	*Tuesday*	*Wednesday*	*Thursday*	*Friday*
Boundary Strength at Home and Positive Emotions	.06	.07	-.07	.04	-.03
Boundary Strength at Home and Negative Emotions	-.26**	-.27**	-.15	-.13	-.25**
Boundary Strength at Work and Positive Emotions	.18*	-.04	.30**	.24**	.11
Boundary Strength at Work and Negative Emotions	-.13	-.10	-.17*	-.35**	-.14

*Note. Ns ranges from 92 to 118. † $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. One-tailed tests are reported.*

Correlations between boundary strength and emotions are reported per day, rather than one overall correlation to avoid violating the assumption of independence.

OTHER FINDINGS

The researcher and supervisor also decided to analyze relations between boundary strength at home and nonwork events, boundary strength at work and work events, as well as emotions and events (all combinations). We decided to include these analyses and report the results in the current study to see whether the relations between boundary strength and events within the same domain would exhibit the same pattern as the relations between boundary strength in one domain (e.g. nonwork) and events in another (e.g. work). Similarly, for the purpose of interest and comparison to past work, we wanted to see the pattern of relations between emotions and events. The results in this section were also analysed with LMM using Model 3 (see Tables 5 and 6 for model comparisons results).

Boundary Strength at Home and Nonwork Events

Boundary strength at home was not related to nonwork events (F [3, 116.48] = 1.73, n.s.). Looking at the pairwise comparisons, the results indicated that on days when participants did not experience any nonwork events, their boundary strength at home was marginally stronger than on days when they had negative nonwork events (see Table 10).

Boundary Strength at Work and Work Events

Overall, the results indicated that work events are not related to participants' boundary strength at work (F [2, 40.17] = 1.1, n.s.) and there were no significant differences in the pairwise comparisons (see Table 11).

Table 10 Means for Boundary Strength at Home Under Different Nonwork Event

Conditions and Results of Post-Hoc Comparisons from LMM analysis (Model 3)

	No Nonwork Event	Negative Nonwork Events	Positive Nonwork Events	Both positive and negative nonwork events
Boundary Strength at Home	3.27[a]	3.14[a, b]	3.27	3.33 [b]

Note. Means with the same superscript differ at p < .10. Comparisons were done using Least Significant

Difference (LSD).

Table 11 Means for Boundary Strength at Work Under Different Work Event Conditions

and Results of Post-Hoc Comparisons from LMM analysis (Model 3)

	No Work Event	Negative Work Events	Positive Work Events
Boundary Strength at Work	3.27	3.14	3.27

Note. Comparisons were done using Least Significant Difference (LSD).

Positive Emotions and Work Events

The results indicated that work events, overall, were significantly related to participants' positive emotions (F [2, 41.43] = 6.68; $p < .01$). Looking at the pairwise comparisons, the results indicated that positive emotions were higher than on days when participants experienced positive work events than on days when they experienced negative work events (see Table 12). Positive emotions were also higher on days when participants did not experience any work events than on days when they experienced negative work events (see Table 12). There was no significant difference in participants' positive emotions on days when they had no work events as compared to days when they had positive work events.

Positive Emotions and Nonwork Events

The results indicated that nonwork events, overall, were significantly related to participants' positive emotions (F [3, 101.31] = 2.74; $p < .05$). For the pairwise comparisons, the results indicated that positive emotions were higher on days when participants experienced positive nonwork events than on days when they experienced negative nonwork events (see Table 13). The results also indicated that on days when participants had no nonwork events, their positive emotions were higher than on days when they experienced negative nonwork events. Finally, participants' mean scores of positive emotions on days when they experienced negative nonwork events were marginally lower than participants' mean scores of positive emotions on days when they had both positive and negative nonwork events.

Table 12 Means for Positive Emotions Under Different Work Event Conditions and Results of Post-Hoc Comparisons from LMM Analysis (Model 3)

	No Work Event	Negative Work Events	Positive Work Events
Positive Emotions	3.09[a]	2.73[a, b]	3.14[b]

Note. Means with superscript a differ at p < .01; means with superscript b differ at p < .05. Comparisons were done using Least Significant Difference (LSD).

Table 13 Means for Positive Emotions Under Different Nonwork Event Conditions and

Results of Post-Hoc Pairwise Comparisons from LMM Analysis (Model 3)

	No Nonwork Events	Negative Nonwork Events	Positive Nonwork Events	Both Positive and Negative Nonwork Events
Positive Emotions	3.08[a]	2.90[a, b, c]	3.21[b]	3.12[c]

Note. Means with superscript a are different at p < .05. Means with superscript b are different at p < .01.

Means with superscript c differ at p < .10. Comparisons were done using Least Significant Difference (LSD).

Negative Emotions and Work Events

The results indicated that work events, overall, are marginally related to participants' negative emotions (F [2, 12.9] = 3.06; *p < .10).* For the pairwise comparisons, the results indicated that participants felt more negative on days when they experienced negative work events than on days when they had no work events (see Table 14). There was no significant difference in participants' negative emotions on days when they had no work events as compared to days when they experienced positive work events.

Negative Emotions and Nonwork Events

The results indicated that nonwork events, overall, are marginally related to participants' negative emotions (F [3, 40.04] = 2.40; *p < .10).* For the pairwise comparisons, the results indicated that participants felt more negative on days when they experienced negative nonwork events than on days when they had no nonwork events (see Table 15). The results also indicated that participants had more negative emotions on days when they had negative nonwork events than on days when they had positive nonwork events. On days when participants had negative nonwork events, they also felt marginally more negative emotions than on days when they had both positive and negative nonwork events.

Table 14 Means for Negative Emotions Under Different Work Event Conditions and

Results of Post-Hoc Comparisons from LMM Analysis (Model 3)

	No Work Event	**Negative Work Events**	**Positive Work Events**
Negative Emotions	1.40[a]	1.52[a]	1.55

Note. Means with superscript a differ at p < .05. Comparisons were done using Least Significant Difference

(LSD).

Table 15 Means for Negative Emotions Under Different Nonwork Event Conditions and

Results of Post-Hoc Comparisons from LMM Analysis (Model 3)

	No Nonwork Event	Negative Nonwork Events	Positive Nonwork Events	Both Positive and Negative Nonwork Events
Negative Emotions	1.40^a	$1.54^{a, b, c}$	1.40^b	1.38^c

Note. Means with the same superscript of a or b differ at p < .05. Means with the superscript c differ at p <

.10. Comparisons were done using Least Significant Difference (LSD).

In sum, a similar pattern of results occurred for the relations between negative events in one domain and boundary strength in the other. I found a weakening of boundaries on days when negative events occurred, which was in line with what Ipredicted. In contrast to predictions, positive events in one domain were not associated with a strengthening of boundaries in the other domain. Rather, positive work events were associated with a weakening of boundary strength at home and no relation was found between positive nonwork events and boundary strength at work. Although I did not hypothesize differences in boundary strength between days when positive events occurred and days when negative events occurred, it is worth reporting that boundary strength at work was weaker on days when participants had negative nonwork events than on days when participants experienced positive nonwork events. I also found a clear pattern for the relations between events and boundary strength within the same domain. The results showed no association between work events and boundary strength at work or between nonwork events and boundary strength at home.

For the correlations between boundary strength and negative emotions, the relations between boundary strength (at home and at work) and negative emotions were negative, although significant results were not found for all days. For the correlations between boundary strength and positive emotions, the relations between boundary strength at work and positive emotions were positive, although significant results were not found for all days, and no significant relations were found between boundary strength at home and positive emotions.

Although I did not hypothesize about the relations between events and emotions, these results are also worth reporting. Consistent with past research, events in people's

work and nonwork lives, overall, were associated with their emotions on days when events occurred, although the results were marginal for the relations between events and negative emotions. I found that, regardless of domains, positive emotions were higher on days when participants had no events or positive events as compared to days when they had negative events. In addition, positive emotions were marginally higher on days when participants had both positive and negative nonwork events than on days when they had only negative nonwork events. Regardless of domains, negative emotions were higher on days when participants had negative events as compared to days when they had no events. In addition, for the relations between negative emotions and nonwork events, negative emotions were higher on days when participants had negative events than on days when they had positive events. On days when participants had both positive and negative nonwork events, their negative emotions were marginally lower than on days when they had only negative nonwork events.

DISCUSSION

This study contributes to an understanding of the cross-domain effect between individuals' work and nonwork lives by focusing on boundary strength. I examined boundary strength at work and at home, events in peoples' work and nonwork lives, and daily emotions. The results highlight how everyday events that occur in one domain are related to boundary strength in the other and how boundary strength is related to emotions on days when events occur.

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 (3a and 3b)

Consistent with H1 and H2, a weakening of boundaries in one domain was observed on days when negative events in the other domain occurred, although the

relations between boundary strength at home and negative work events were marginal. A possible explanation for these results can be drawn from spillover theory, which suggests a transfer of negative energy, moods, or feelings from one domain to the other. As suggested in the introduction, I suspect that a weakening of boundaries in one domain on days when negative events occur in the other probably stems from negative emotional spillover. Consistent with past research (e.g. Clark& Watson, 1988; David, Green, Martin,& Suls, 1997; Eck, Nicolson,& Berkhof, 1998;Gable Reis,& Elliot., 2000; Lazarus, 1991; Suh, Deiner,& Fujita, 1996; Tesser& Beach, 1998; Zautra and Simon, 1979), the results revealed that negative emotions were related to negative events (see results in "Other Findings" section). Consistent with H3a and H3b, we also found that negative emotions were negatively related to boundary strength at work and at home, although the results were not significant for all days. This is consistent with research that has demonstrated that negative emotions in one domain can spillover to the other which may deteriorate the functioning in the other role (e.g. Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Thompson, Kirk,& Brown, 2005). Accordingly, although individuals may leave the domain in which negative events occur, their negative emotions may permeate the current domain though a negative emotional spillover making it difficult for individuals to keep the two domains separated from one another, which explains a weakening of boundaries in one domain on days when negative events occur in the other.

Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 (6a and 6b)

H4 and H5 were not supported. In contrast to what we predicted, we found a weakening of boundaries at home on days when positive events occurred at work. Our results, therefore, are not coherent with the family-enrichment model (Greenhaus and Powell, 2006) or with Rothbard's finding (2001) that positive affect experienced from the

family domain is positively associated with absorption in work roles. A possible explanation as to why a weakening, rather than a strengthening, of boundaries at home on days when positive work events occurred can be drawn from the broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions (Fredrickson, 2001) and the process of capitalization on positive events (see Gable and Reise, 2001; Langston, 1994; Gable, Reise, Impett, and Asher, 2004; Reise, Smith, Carmichael, Caprariello, Tsai, Rodrigues, and Maniaci, 2010).

According to the broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions, "..positive emotions that follow personal achievements (e.g. positive events) broadens by creating the urge to share news of the achievement with others and to envision greater achievements in the future" (Fredrickson, 2001, p. 220). Similarly, capitalization is a process of "telling others about positive events in one's life" (Gable et al., 2004, p. 229). One of the main functions of capitalization is for individuals to build social resources (Gable and Reise, 2001; Gable et al., 2004; Reise et al., 2010). Whether a process of capitalization on positive events with respect to building social resources will be successful depends on the listeners' anticipated response (Reise et al., 2010). This may help explain why a weakening of boundaries at home was found on days when positive events at work occurred whereas no relation was found for work boundaries and positive nonwork events. Possibly, individuals have close relationships and feel more comfortable, and trusting to share positive events at work with their loved ones at home, which is reflected in a weakening of the boundary at home on days when positive work events occur. The same intimate relationships may not be found between individuals and their co-workers. In this case, individuals may not be willing to open up and share their positive nonwork experiences when they are at work.

Consistent with H6a, a positive correlation was found between positive emotions and boundary strength at work, although significant results were not found for all days. These findings are in line with Rothbard's argument and findings (2001) that positive emotions are associated with absorption in a role. In this case, it then makes sense why a strengthening of boundary at work occurs when individuals feel positive. These results are also consistent with previous findings that positive emotions do have favourable outcomes in the workplace (see Staw et al., 1994). Intriguingly, these results seem to be inconsistent with H5 in which no support was found for the relations between positive nonwork events and boundary strength at work. I suspect that positive nonwork events may not be antecedents of boundary strength at work. Possibly, when individuals are at work, organizational factors (i.e. policies, cultures, and rules) may exhibit a more prominent association with boundary strength at work than positive nonwork events. These organizational policies, rules, and cultures are established to guide employee behaviour, including how/what/where/ and/or when employees should act as part of the collective entity. Organizations also have power to create policies, rules, and cultures that mark employees' spatial (e.g. where their employees work) and temporal boundaries (e.g. what time their employees have to be physically present at work or can leave their work). Accordingly, the relations between positive nonwork events and boundary strength at work may be overridden by these organizational factors. Additionally, positive emotions can also be triggered by other factors such as organizational factors, rather than only positive nonwork events. If so, then it makes sense to why relations were found between positive emotions and boundary strength at work whereas no relations were found between positive nonwork events and boundary strength at work. This can possibly be an avenue for future research to examine whether antecedents of boundary strength at work and emotions at work are the same as those of boundary strength at home and emotions at home. H6b was not supported as no

correlations were found between positive emotions and boundary strength at home. Interestingly, these results also provide evidence that antecedents and/or factors that are related to boundary strength at work and boundary strength at home may not be the same. This issue is discussed further in the section on direction for future research.

The results also highlight the bi-directional nature of boundary strength which states that work may not permeate nonwork at the same extent as nonwork permeate work (see Bulger, Hoffman, & Matthews, 2007; Hecht& Allen, 2009; Olson-Buchanan, & Boswell, 2006). Particularly, significant results were found between negative nonwork events and boundary strength at work and between positive work events and boundary strength at home, whereas marginal results were found between negative work events and boundary strength at home and no relations were found between positive nonwork events and boundary strength at work. In this study, it seems that nonwork permeated work more on days when participants experienced negative events than on days when participants experienced positive events; whereas work permeated nonwork more on days when participants experienced positive events than on days when participants had negative events. Accordingly, antecedents of boundary strength at work and their consequences may not be the same as those of boundary strength at home (Hecht and Allen, 2009).

Strengths and Limitations

The strongest point in this study lies in a better understanding of daily boundary strength and its antecedents, which, to date, has received limited research attention. The results of this study also provide further support for the notion that antecedents and consequences of boundary strength at work and at home may not be the same (Hecht and Allen, 2009). A daily diary methodology was used in this study, which incorporated

both qualitative and quantitative data making the present research richer. Further, daily dairy data are believed to provide more reliable and valid information about individuals' day-to-day experiences because the time interval between the experience of an event and the report of that event is short (Grzywacz, Almeida,& Mcdonald, 2002), which can reduce memory biases (Oishi, Diener, Prieto, Choi and Choi, 2007). There are also strengths and limitations in the sample used in this study. In terms of strength, the sample presented in this study consisted of employed parents who simultaneously managed and negotiated boundaries and demands stemming from occupying multiple roles between work and nonwork domains. The sample provides appropriate real-life insights of the relations and interface between individuals' work and nonwork lives. However, the majority of the sample in this study was comprised of people with a high level of education (graduate degree), who were professionals with high family incomes; therefore, this sample may not be used to generalize to every working population (e.g. it may not apply to blue-collar workers).

Although I based our coding of negative and positive events from published hassles and uplifts scales, I did not directly ask participants to report events and their valence. There may be differences in individuals' perception of what can be called an "event". For example, some people may perceive "not having to do homework with a child" as a positive nonwork event, whereas some may not perceive this occurrence as an event. Such perceptions may affect the consistency of what can be called an event in this study. Further, the current study did not measure dispositional factors. It is possible that individuals react to events differently and not at the same level of intensity (Kernis, McNamara, Waschull, Berry, Herlocker, and Abend, 1999). For example, one person may react more strongly to negative events than does another person. In this case, the extent or level of intensity to which individuals react to events may influence the extent to

which they place or maintain boundary strength at work/at home on days when events occur. Another issue is that we cannot be certain that reported emotions were elicited by events alone, because we only asked how people felt for the day as a whole. There can be other factors that are related to daily emotions.

Direction for Future Research

Future research should sample from a more diverse population (e.g. job type, income, educational level, etc). Future research could also examine individual difference factors. Past research has recognized that individuals perceive, interpret, and respond to events differently (e.g. Langston, 1994; Watson, 1988, etc). Such dispositional factors may moderate the relationships between events in one domain and boundary strength in the other, as noted above. One potential factor to be considered is role identification. According to boundary and micro role transition theory (Ashforth et al., 2000), role identification is related to how individuals react to cross-role interruptions, such that individuals with high work role identification may respond differently to nonwork interruptions at work than individuals with lower work-role identification. Hecht and Allen's longitudinal study (2009) found support that work role identification predicted boundary strength at home. Thus, it could be that the relation between boundary strength at home and work events is different for people with different levels of work role identification.

Another potential factor that may moderate relations between events in one domain and boundary strength in the other is individuals' preferences for role segmentation-integration. Ashforth et al. (2000) suggested that individuals have freedom over their role selections and that each person has preferences for the extent to which h/she segments or integrates the selected social roles. Although there is limited

evidence as to why one person prefers to segment or integrate his/her social roles (Olson-Buchanan& Boswell, 2006), research has shown that individuals' preferences for role segmentation-integration do exist (see Kossek et al., 2006; Matthews& Barnes-Farrell, 2010; Rothbard 2005). There is also evidence that individuals' preferences for role segmentation-integration are related to work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict; for example, Kossek et al. (2006) found that the higher an individual's preference for role integration, the greater family-to-work-conflict and vice versa. In that case, individuals' preferences for role segmentation-integration may influence relations between events in one domain and boundary strength in the other such that on days when events in one domain occur, boundary strength in the other domain may become weaker for a person whose preference is on role integration than that of a person whose preference is on role segmentation.

Finally, it will also be worthwhile to investigate whether relations between work-events and boundary strength at home are affected by different factors than relations between nonwork events and boundary strength at work. It is possible that role identification and boundary preferences may not influence the relations between work events and boundary strength at home and the relations between nonwork events and boundary strength at work at the same extent. Possibly, organizational factors may be a better moderator when it comes to relations between nonwork events and boundary strength at work than individual factors. Particularly, the extent to which employees have latitude over their boundaries at work is limited by organizational factors and contexts, suggesting that organizational policies can demarcate and/or limit the extent to which nonwork permeates work (Olson-Buchanan&Boswell, 2006). For example, Perlow (1998) conducted a field study with a high-tech corporation to examine how managers exerted control over their employees' boundaries at work, finding that many managers

actively prevented employees' personal lives from intruding on the work setting. She found that organizations, and managers in particular, through techniques of imposing demands, monitoring employees, and modeling the behaviours they want their employees to exhibit, have some power to specify and influence how employees separate their time between their work and personal lives (Perlow, 1998). Accordingly, organizational factors may also be a potential moderator for the relations between nonwork-events and boundary strength at work.

Conclusions

As employees' nonwork demands have grown (Kossek, Noe,& Demarr, 1999), an increasing number of employees are lamenting the difficulty of managing their work and personal lives (Hecht & Allen, 2009). There have been changes in working conditions (e.g., 24/7 working hours, telecommuting, virtual offices, and increased speed in competition), changes in the workforce (e.g., more single parents and dual-income families), and changes in communication technologies (e.g. internet, emails, web conference), all of which have made work-nonwork boundaries become increasingly weak (e.g. Brannen, 2005; Hecht& Allen, 2009; Kossek et al., 1999; Raghuram & Wisenfeld, 2004). Corporate investment in organizational policies aiming to respond to work-family issues has grown accordingly (Kossek et al., 1999) and an understanding of boundaries between work and personal lives has become critical.

This study responds to these issues by providing insights of how everyday events that occur in one domain are related to boundaries in the other domain and how daily emotions are related to boundary strength at work and at home. This knowledge will help individuals understand their daily experiences of how to manage their work-nonwork boundaries more effectively on days when events occur. Particularly, it should

allow individuals to be aware of the relations between daily events and the extent to which they negotiate and manage their work-nonwork boundaries on days when events occur, which, in turn, may alleviate conflicts, and enhance the balance between domains. It should also help organizations to initiate more effective work-family policies to attract and retain potential employees as well as increase organizational effectiveness. Organizations may initiate workshops or work-nonwork programs to provide their employees with knowledge of the cross-domain effects on days when events occur. For example, the results of this study highlight positive correlations between boundary strength at work and positive emotions. In this case, organizations may initiate training programs to encourage their employees to capitalize on positive emotions or experiences. Indeed, research has shown that employees' positive emotions have beneficial outcomes in the workplace (see Staw et al., 1994). In this case, when employees feel positive, their boundaries at work tend to be stronger, which may help employees focus on enacting their work roles. A weakening of boundaries, however, was found on days when negative events occurred. As noted earlier, research has found that weak boundaries are related to role conflicts and that negative emotions have negative outcomes for individuals' overall well-being. In this case, organizations may educate employees of how to manage the boundaries between domains in order to relieve conflicts that may stem from weakening boundaries on days when negative events occur.

This study responds to a call for research on work-nonwork boundary strength by providing empirical evidence for potential antecedents (i.e. daily events) of boundary strength, which to date, has received limited attention. It also expands our knowledge of how daily negative and positive emotions play different roles in relation to boundary strength at work and at home. In conclusion, situational contexts such as daily events

may influence how individuals place strong or weak boundaries between domains. Additionally, antecedents of boundary strength at work may not be the same as those of boundary strength at home. This also implies that consequences of boundary strength at work and at home may also be different. This can be a fruitful avenue for future research to explore.

REFERENCES

Affleck, G., Tennen, H., Urrows, S.,& Higgins, P. (1994). Person and contextual features of daily stress reactivity: Individual differences in relations of undesirable daily events with mood disturbance and chronic pain intensity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66: 329-340.

Allen, T.D., Herst, D.E.L., Bruck, C.S.,& Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5: 278-308.

Ashforth, B.E., Kreiner, G.E., &Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and Micro Role Transitions. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25: 472-491.

Barnett, R.C.,& Hyde, J.S. (2001). Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist theory. *American Psychologist*, 56: 781-796.

Brannen, J. (2005). Time and the negotiation of work-family boundaries: Autonomy or illusion? *Time &Society*, 14: 113-131.

Bulger, C.A., Hoffman, M.E., &Matthews, R.A. (2007). Work and personal life boundary management: Boundary strength, work/personal life balance, and the segmentation-integration continuum. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12: 365-375.

Burke, P.J. (1991). Identity processes and social stress. *American Sociological Review*, 56: 836-849.

Carlson, D.S., Kacmar, K.M., Wayne, J.H.,& Grzywacz, J.G. (2006). Measuring the positive side of the work-family interface: Development and validation of a work-family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68: 131-164.

Chesley, N. (2005). Blurring boundaries? Linking technology use, spillover, individual distress, and family satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67: 1237-1248.

Clark, S.C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations,* 53: 747-770.

Clark, L.A.,& Watson, D. (1988). Mood and the mundane: Relations between daily life events and self-reported mood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54: 296-308.

Cohan, C.L.,& Bradbury, T.N. (1997). Negative life events, marital interaction, and the longitudinal course of newlywed marriage. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1: 114-128.

Cohen, L.H., Gunthert, K.C., Butler, A.C., Parrish, B.P., Wenze, S.J.,& Beck, J.S. (2008). Negative affective spillover from daily events predicts early response to cognitive therapy for depression. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 76: 955-965.

Cohen, S., Tyrrell, D.A.J.,& Smith, A.P. (1993). Negative life events, perceived stress, negative affect, and susceptibility to the common cold. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64: 131-140.

Compas, B.E., Davis, G.E., Forsythe, C.J.,& Wagner, B.M. (1987). Assessment of major and daily stressful events during adolescence: The adolescent perceived events scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55: 534-541.

Crouter, A.C. (1984). Spillover from family to work: The neglected side of the work-family interface. *Human Relations*, 37: 425-441.

David, J.P., Green, P.J., Martin, R.,& Suls, J. (1997). Differential roles of neuroticism, extraversion, and event desirability for mood in daily life: An integrative model of top-down and bottom-up influences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73: 149-159.

Eby, L.T., Casper, W.J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C.,& Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980-2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66: 124-197.

Edwards, J.R.,& Rothbard, N.P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family construct. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25: 178-199.

Folkman, S.,& Moskowitz, J. T. (2000). Positive Affect and the other side of coping. *American Psychologist*, 55: 647-654.

Ford, M.T., Heinen, B.A.,& Langkamer, K.L. (2007). Work and family satisfaction and conflict: A meta-analysis of cross-domain relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 57-80.

Fredrickson, B.L. (1998). What good are positive emotions? *Review of General Psychology*, 2: 300-319.

Fredrickson, B.L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56: 218-226.

Fredrickson, B.L. (2003). The value of positive emotions: The emerging science of positive psychology is coming to understand why it's good to feel good. *American Scientist*, 91: 330-335.

Fredrickson, B.L.,& Branigan, C. (2005). Positive emotions broaden the scope of attention and thought-action repertoires. *Cognition and Emotion*, 19: 313-332.

Fredrickson, B.L.,& Losada, M. F. (2005). Positive affect and the complex dynamics of human flourishing. *American Psychologist*, 60: 678-686.

Gable, S.L., Reis, H.T.,& Elliot, A.J. (2000). Behavioral activation and inhibition in everyday life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78: 1135-1149.

Gable, S.L., Reis, H.T., Impett, E.A.,& Asher, E.R. (2004). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87: 228-245.

Golden, A.G.,& Geisler, C. (2007). Work-life boundary management and the personal digital assistant. *Human Relations,* 60: 519-551.

Greenhaus, J.H.,& Beutell, N.J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10: 76-88.

Greenhaus, J.H.,& Powell, G.N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *The Academy of Management Review*, 31: 72-92.

Gross, S. Semmer, N.K., Meier, L.L., Kalin, W., Jacobshagen, N.,& Tschan, F. (2011). The effect of positive events at work on after-work fatigue: They matter most in face of adversity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96:654-664.

Grzywacz, J.G. (2000). Work-family spillover and health during midlife: Is managing conflict everything? *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 14: 236-243.

Grzywacz, J.G., Almeida, D.M.,& McDonald, D.A. (2002). Work-family spillover and daily reports of work and family stress in the adult labor force. *Family Relations*, 51: 28-36.

Grzywacz, J.G.,& Bass, B.L. (2003). Work, family, and mental health: Testing different models of work-family fit. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65:248-261.

Grzywacz, J.G.,& Marks, N.F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5: 111-126.

Hall, D.T., &Richter, J. (1988). *The Academy of Management EXECUTIVE*, 2: 213-223.

Hammer, L.B., Cullen, J.C., Neal, M.B., Sinclair, R.R.,& Shafiro, M.V. (2005). The longitudinal effects of work-family conflict and positive spillover on depressive

symptoms among dual-earner couples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10: 138-154.

Hammer, L.B., Neal, M.B., Newsom, J.T., Brockwood, K.J.,& Colton, C.L. (2005). A longitudinal study of the effects of dual-earner couples' utilization of family-friendly workplace supports on work and family outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90: 799-810.

Hecht, T.D.,& Allen, N.J. (2009). A longitudinal examination of the work-nonwork boundary strength construct. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 30: 839-862.

Hecht, T.D.,& Boies, K. (2009). Structure and correlates of spillover from nonwork to work: An examination of nonwork activities, well-being, and work outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14: 414-426.

Kabanoff, B. (1980). Work and nonwork: A review of models, methods, and findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88: 60-77.

Kanner, A.D., Coyne, J.C., Schaefer, C.,& Lazarus, R.S. (1981). Comparison of two modes of stress measurement: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 4: 1-39.

Kossek, E.E., Lautsch, B.A., &Eaton, S.C. (2006). Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: Correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work-family effectiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68: 347-367.

Kossek, E.E.,& Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83: 139-149.

Lambert, S. (1990). Processes Linking work and family: A critical review and research agenda. *Human Relations*, 43: 239-257

Langston, C.A. (1994). Capitalizing on and coping with daily-life events: Expressive responses to positive events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67: 1112-1125.

Lewinsohn, P.M.,& Graf, M. (1973). Pleasant activities and depression. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 41: 261-268.

Matthews, R.A.,& Barnes-Farrell, J.L. (2010). Development and initial evaluation of an enhanced measure of boundary flexibility for the work and family domains. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15: 330-346.

Meissmer, M. (1971). The long arm of the job: A study of work and leisure. *Industrial Relations*, 10: 239-260.

Near, J.P., Rice, R.W.,& Hunt, R.G. (1980). The relationship between work and nonwork domains: A review of empirical research. *The academy of Management Review*, 5: 415-429.

Nezlek, J.B.,& Gable, S.L. (2001). Depression as a moderator of relationships between positive daily events and day-to-day psychological adjustment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27: 1692-1704.

Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Parker, L.E., Larson, J. (1994). Ruminative coping with depressed mood following loss. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67: 92-104.

Nippert-Eng, C. E. (1995). **Home and work: Negotiating boundaries through everyday life**. *The University of Chicago Press*, Chicago, IL.

Oishi, S., Diener, E., Choi, D-W., Kim-Prieto, C.,& Choi, I. (2007). The dynamics of daily events and well-being across cultures: When less is more. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* 93: 685-698.

Olson-Buchanan, J.B.,& Boswell, W.R. (2006). Blurring boundaries: Correlates of integration and segmentation between work and nonwork. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 68: 432-445.

Pillow, D.R., Zautra, A.J.,& Sandler, I. (1996). Major life events and minor stressors: Identifying meditational links in the stress process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70: 381-394.

Raghuram, S.,& Wiesenfeld, B. (2004). Work-nonwork conflict and job stress among virtual workers. *Human Resource Management*, 43: 259-277.

Rau, B.L.,& Hyland, M.M. (2002). Role conflict and flexible work arrangements: The effects on applicant attraction. *Personnel Psychology*, 55: 111-136.

Rothbard, N.P. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46: 655-684.

Schulz, M.S., Cowan, P.A., Cowan, C.P.,& Brennan, R.T. (2004). Coming home upset: Gender, marital satisfaction, and the daily spillover of workday experience into couple interactions. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 18: 250-263.

Staw, B.M., Sutton, R.I.,& Pelled, L.H. (1994). Employee positive emotion and favorable outcomes at the workplace. *Organization Science*, 5: 51-71.

Stets, J.E.,& Burke, P.J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63: 224-237.

Suh, E., Diener, E.,& Fujita, F. (1996). Events and subjective well-being: Only recent events matter. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5: 1091-1102.

Taylor, S.E. (1991). Asymmetrical effects of positive and negative events: The mobilization-minimization hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110: 67-85.

Tesser, A.,& Beach, S.R.H. (1998). Life events, relationship quality, and depression: An investigation of judgment discontinuity in Vivo. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74: 36-52.

Thompson, B.M., Kirk, A.,& Brown, D.F. (2005). Work based support, emotional exhaustion, and spillover of work stress to the family environment: A study of policewomen. *Stress and Health*, 21: 199-207.

van Eck, M., Nicolson, N.A.,& Berkhof, J. (1998). Effects of stressful daily events on mood states: Relationship to global perceived stress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75: 1572-1585.

Wagner, B.M., Compas, B.E.,& Howell, D.C. (1988). *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16: 189-205.

Wayne, J.H., Randel, A.E.,& Stevens, J. (2006). The role of identity and work-family support in work-family enrichment and its work-related consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69: 445-461.

Weiss, H.M.,& Cropanzano (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 18: 1-74.

Williams, K.J.,& Alliger, G.M. (1994). Role stressors, mood spillover, and perceptions of work-family conflict in employed parents. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37: 837-868.

Williams, K.J., Suls, J., Alliger, G.M., Learner, S.M.,& Wan, C.K. (1991). Multiple role juggling and daily mood states in working mothers: An experience sampling study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76: 664-674.

Zautra, A.J., Reich, J.W.,& Guarnaccia, C.A. (1990). Some everyday life consequences of disability and bereavement for older adults. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59: 550-561.

Zautra, A.,& Simons, L.S. (1979). Some effects of positive life events on community mental health. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 7: 441-451.

APPENDIX A: CODING INSTRUCTIONS

CODING OF DAILY EVENTS

For this task, you will have to read comments that were originally written in daily diaries and then code several things based on what you have read.

First, you must determine whether each comment describes an "event" that was experienced by the writer. For the purpose of this study, an event is defined as something that is not a regular daily occurrence (i.e., something that does not happen every day). Some events may be relatively rare (e.g., being on vacation, making a mistake at work); others are more common (e.g., getting support with childcare, having extra tasks to do at work). You are being asked to decide if each comment describes an event and, if so, to code the event into one of 4 categories: negative work events, positive work events, negative nonwork events, and positive nonwork events.

A list of positive and negative events in work and nonwork domains has been provided. Each of these events has been numbered. Please read participants' comments and specify, using the numbers provided, whether each comment describes a hassle or an uplift at work or outside of work. In each case, there is a number for e.g. "other positive nonwork events" that can be used if you feel that the person experienced an event, but the event does not appear on the list that has been provided.

It is worth noting that a participant may report more than one event for a given day. In this case, please code each event that has occurred and write all of the numbers separated by commas (e.g. 12, 20). If the person did not write a comment or the comment written does not describe an event, please put zeros in each category for that day.

Comment	Negative Work Events	Positive Work Events	Negative Nonwork Events	Positive Nonwork Events
Today was rough. My son had a fit when I dropped him off at daycare and I got to work late. One of my coworkers is on vacation on I had to pick up the slack doing his work tasks. Despite that, I found time to go to the gym and I felt good about that.	74	0	23	7,19

Following pages are the lists of nonwork and work events. Each includes uplifts,

hassles, and boundary strength items in nonwork and work domains.

NONWORK EVENTS

Positive

1. Eating out
2. Celebrating a birthday, holiday, or special event with family
3. Health of family member improving
4. Recovering from illness
5. Socializing with friends
6. Attending a movie, concert, or other entertainment event
7. Engaging in exercise or recreation
8. Enjoying children's accomplishment
9. Doing volunteer work or contributing to a charity
10. Being on vacation/having a day off from work
11. Receiving support from friends or family (including help with childcare)
12. Giving support to family or friends
13. Attending a child's school or extracurricular activity
14. Getting extra/enough sleep or rest
15. Completing a task at home
16. Spending extra time with family
17. Making vacation plans
18. Not having to do homework with children
19. Having extra/enough time for myself
20. Other positive nonwork events

Negative

21. Having to wait for an appointment or service
22. Being sick or injured
23. Having a problem with your child
24. Bad weather
25. Hassles from ex-spouse
26. Missing a family activity
27. Being stuck in unusually bad traffic

28. Having an argument or conflicts with your spouse/partner
29. Family member being sick or injured
30. Death of friend or acquaintance
31. Attending a funeral
32. Doctor's appointment for self or family member
33. Not getting enough rest or sleep
34. Missing a child's school or extracurricular activity
35. Having a problem with childcare or child's school
36. Partner being out of town
37. Child being upset when you went to work
38. Problem at nonwork activity
39. Unspecified/other personal or family problem
40. Issue related to care of pet
41. Issues related to planning or preparing meals (including grocery shopping)
42. Having extra tasks to do at home
43. Problems with divorce or separation
44. Not enough time with family
45. Transportation problems
46. Received distressing communication from family or friend
47. Child is away (or planning to go away) from home
48. Getting (or worried about getting) flu/H1N1 shot with family
49. Being late for pick-up or drop-off at child's daycare
50. Taking/driving child to sports practice/extracurricular activity
51. Errands and messages to do
52. Other negative nonwork events

WORK EVENTS

Positive

53. Completing a work task
54. Solving problems at work
55. Resolving interpersonal conflicts at work
56. Boss pleased with your work
57. Gaining new skills and/or doing something new at work
58. Changing to a better job
59. Receiving support from your supervisor or employer
60. Company event or departmental get-together (including lunch with colleagues)
61. Starting a work task that has been pending
62. Having a success on work task or project
63. Other positive work events

Negative

64. Making mistakes at work
65. Problems with employees, co-workers, clients, supervisor, or employer
66. Having an interpersonal conflict with co-workers, clients, supervisor, or employer
67. Missing a deadline at work
68. Equipment failure at work
69. Having extra tasks to do at work

70. Changes or uncertainty at work (e.g. reorganization)
71. Shortage of staff at work
72. Approaching deadline at work
73. Not receiving support from your supervisor or employer
74. Not completing a task at work
75. Problems at work
76. Skipping lunch or taking a shortened lunch break
77. Receiving distressing communication at work
78. Other negative work events