Explaining the effect of work-nonwork boundary management fit on satisfaction and performance at home through reduced time- and strain-based work-family conflict.

De Gieter, Sara; De Cooman, Rein; Bogaerts, Yanne; Verelst, Lorenz

Published in:
Applied Psychology

DOI:
10.1111/apps.12314

Publication date:
2022

License:
Unspecified

Document Version:
Accepted author manuscript

Citation for published version (APA):

Copyright
No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form, without the prior written permission of the author(s) or other rights holders to whom publication rights have been transferred, unless permitted by a license attached to the publication (a Creative Commons license or other), or unless exceptions to copyright law apply.

Take down policy
If you believe that this document infringes your copyright or other rights, please contact openaccess@vub.be, with details of the nature of the infringement. We will investigate the claim and if justified, we will take the appropriate steps.

Download date: 24. Sep. 2023
Explaining the Effect of Work-Nonwork Boundary Management Fit on Satisfaction and Performance at Home Through Reduced Time- and Strain-based Work-Family Conflict

Sara De Gieter¹*, Rein De Cooman², Yanne Bogaerts² & Lorenz Verelst²

¹ Research Group of Work & Organizational Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Brussel
² Department of Work and Organisation Studies, KU Leuven

Author note

Sara De Gieter - https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5596-9076

Rein De Cooman - https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0776-1465

We have no conflict of interest to disclose.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sara De Gieter, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Pleinlaan 2, 1050 Brussel, Belgium. Phone: +32 (0)2 629 18 37. Email: sara.de.gieter@vub.be.
EXPLAINING THE EFFECT OF WORK-NONWORK BOUNDARY MANAGEMENT FIT ON SATISFACTION AND PERFORMANCE AT HOME THROUGH REDUCED TIME- AND STRAIN-BASED CONFLICT

Being confronted with rising numbers of long-term employee absenteeism threatening organizational performance, urges both employers and HR scholars to adhere a broader perspective on employee functioning and well-being both on and off the job (Ipsen, Karanika-Murray, & Nardelli, 2020). Creating, supporting and maintaining a sustainable workforce became a key concern for employers and policy makers in order to assure future company success and welfare (Kossek, Valcour, & Lirio, 2014; van Engen, Vinkenburg, & Dikkers, 2012). A sustainable workforce reflects a situation where employees’ work situation creates the opportunity to balance work and private life throughout their career in such a way that fosters their functioning and well-being, and makes employees thrive both at work and in their personal lives (Kossek et al., 2014). Combining work and family roles can bring enrichment in both life domains, yet, it can also result in conflicting situations and decreased performance and wellbeing in and off the job (Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elfering, & Semmer, 2011; McNall, Nicklin, & Masuda, 2010; Zhang, Xu, Jin, & Ford, 2018). Recent policy statements on sustainable work indeed emphasize the importance of a career-long harmonious work-family interface and urge employees and employers to be cautious for the possible negative impact of work on private life and well-being (Eurofound, 2016, 2018).

For some years now, organizations are providing work-family support policies and practices (such as flextime, childcare and teleworking) in an attempt to help their employees with balancing work and family demands (Butts, Casper, & Yang, 2013; Daniel & Sonnentag, 2016; Kelly, Kossek, Hammer, Durham, Bray, Chermack, & Kaskubar, 2008). Yet, the effectiveness of these policies varies between individual employees and largely seems to
depend on individual differences in work-nonwork boundary preferences between employees (Rothbard, Phillips, & Dumas, 2005). Organizational work-family practices that are not aligned with an employee’s personal needs and preferences, frustrate a harmonious work-family interface and, consequently, sustainable work. Drawing on Person-Environment (PE) Fit Theory (Kristof, 1996), an important new concept in this regard is work-nonwork boundary management fit, being the degree to which employees’ personal preferences and needs for setting boundaries between their work and family roles align with the work-family supplies offered by their work environment and supported by their employer (Bogaerts, De Cooman, & De Gieter, 2018). According to PE fit research, experiencing a fitting work environment has beneficial effects on individuals’ mental health, satisfaction and functioning (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman & Johnson, 2005). Several studies (e.g. Bogaerts et al., 2018; Chen, Powell, & Greenhaus, 2009; Kreiner, 2006; Rothbard et al., 2005) already showed that fit with regard to the work-family interface is indeed associated with favorable attitudes and well-being at work (e.g., higher job satisfaction, higher organizational commitment, lower turnover intention). Yet, from a sustainable workforce perspective also the impact on employees’ family and personal life matters (Kossek et al., 2014).

With this paper we tackle the knowledge gap on how this particular sense of fit influences employees life outside the workplace, crucial in creating and maintaining a sustainable workforce. To explain this link, we draw on the concept of work-family conflict which is key in the work-family interface literature (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Frone, Russel, & Cooper, 1992). Our aim is to examine how employees’ work experiences (here work-nonwork boundary management fit) influence functional and affective home outcomes (here performance in and satisfaction with their family life) through the experience of higher or lower levels of work-family conflict. More in particular, we propose that work-nonwork boundary management fit reduces the chance of time- and strain-based work-family conflict to occur and
consequently improves employees’ performance in and satisfaction with their family life, both crucial and only modestly interrelated home outcomes impacting someone's general health and well-being (Chen, Shaffer, Westman, Chen, Lazarova, & Reiche, 2014; McElwain, Korabik, & Rosin, 2005).

This study contributes to the literature in different ways. First, we contribute to the debate on sustainability within HRM theory and research. One of the core tenets in creating a sustainable workforce is the possible impact of work experiences on employees’ family life and how to support a sustainable work-family interface (Kossek et al., 2014). Yet, this relationship remains unclear and, as a result, current HR practices implemented to support employees’ work-family interface are mainly based on speculation instead of being evidence-based. In this study, we explicitly test one possible work-family spillover mechanism, by elaborating on the role of work-nonwork boundary management fit and work-family conflict. Second, considering the work-family interface from a PE fit perspective and linking this to work-family conflict (the particular mechanism that we put forward) will contribute both to the fit literature grounded in the idea of individual differences as well as the work-family literature grounded in the idea of interaction between both life domains. Thereby, we extend both streams of literature. We extend the fit literature to the work-family interface domain and replicate the often put forward link between work-family conflict and family outcomes. Finally, from a more methodological perspective, we strengthen our contributions to the literature by cross-validating the proposed mechanism in two separate studies.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Work-nonwork boundary management fit

The concept of work-nonwork boundary management fit stems from person-environment (PE) theory where fit is defined as the compatibility that occurs when workers
match the characteristics of the work environment that they inhabit, and vice versa work environments align with the characteristics of the people they employ (Kristof, 1996). It specifically describes employees’ experience of congruence (i.e. fit) between their personal boundary preference and work-family supplies in their work setting (Bogaerts et al., 2018). It is thus a specific form of PE fit based on work-nonwork boundary management as described in Boundary Theory (Nippert-Eng, 1996). This theory postulates that individuals as well as work environments differ in the boundaries they want or allow to exist between the professional and the family life domain. Both employees and work settings differ on this extending from (preference for or facilitation of) complete separation between both domains and far-reaching integration in which both domains are intermingled (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000, Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). As Rothbard and colleagues state, boundary preference represents an employee’s position on a continuum ranging from segmentation to integration and is rather stable over time (Rothbard et al., 2005). Reasoning further on this means that the possibilities offered by an organization to draw and manage such boundaries (i.e. organizational work-family supplies) will probably not be able to perfectly meet the boundary preference of each individual employee in a work setting (Rothbard et al., 2005). Particular combinations of work-family support policies and practices, organizational culture and role models within a work setting foster a certain degree of integration or segmentation and will be more or less aligned with an employee’s preferred boundary management resulting in the experience of work nonwork boundary management fit (Ammons, 2011). Hence, fit occurs when employees perceive their work environment to provide the work-family supplies needed to construct and enact work-nonwork boundaries in accordance with their personal boundary preference (Bogaerts et al., 2018).

As explicated in PE fit theory and more specifically in the literature on needs-supplies fit, the experience of fit stems from the underlying process of cognitive comparison between the amount of a particular resource that one needs and the amount of that resource the environment supplies (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Numerous empirical evidence support the notion that employees flourish in ‘fitting’ work environments and are more likely to attribute positive emotions to it and develop positive attitudes and behaviors because their psychological
needs are satisfied and they can manifest their true self and personality (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Su, Murdock, & Rounds, 2015). Thus, for instance an employee who prefers a high level of work-family integration will probably experience a high level of work-nonwork boundary management fit in an organization that provides work-family practices and an organizational culture that highly value and facilitate integration (e.g., allowing employees to attend family-related matters during office hours, but also consenting them to react to work emergencies during leisure time), while another employee preferring high levels of work-family segmentation will experience low levels of fit when he or she experiences this work setting in the same way. Fit and also this particular type of fit is thus a relevant idiosyncratic state, here reflecting the perceived degree of (mis)match between personal boundary preferences and the boundaries allowed or expected in a particular work setting. Fit is not only important because of its beneficial outcomes (e.g. low turnover intentions, positive attitudes towards the organization, high core self-evaluation), it is also intentionally sought-after by employees. Studies demonstrate that people care greatly about PE fit, as evidenced by the fact that people selectively look for environments in which they expect to find fit (Judge & Cable, 1997; Schneider, 1987; Yu, 2014), and actively try to develop and maintain a sufficient level of fit with their environment after being selected into a specific job and organization (e.g., Follmer, Talbot, Kristof-Brown, Astrove, & Billsberry, 2018; Vogel, Rodell, & Lynch, 2016).

Empirical work on PE fit in the work-family context (e.g., Chen et al., 2009; Foucreault, Ollier-Malaterre & Ménard, 2016; Kreiner, 2006; Rothbard et al., 2005) indeed supports the notion that fit or congruence between boundary preferences and organizational work-family supplies relates positively to employee and organization outcomes. The interaction between both matters in that for instance work-family supplies fostering integration (e.g., flextime and teleworking) mainly appeal to employees who desire integration, for whom these HR practices and processes especially enhance job satisfaction and organizational commitment compared to employees who rather desire segmentation (Rau & Hyland, 2002; Rothbard et al., 2005). Moreover, research on the perception of fit focusing on the felt alignment rather than the mere interaction between preferences and organizational supplies demonstrates that work-nonwork boundary management fit is associated with favorable attitudes and well-being in the
workplace, including higher job satisfaction, higher organizational commitment, less turnover intention, less stress and less work-family conflict (Bogaerts et al., 2018). Yet, with this paper we tackle the knowledge gap on how this particular sense of fit influences employees outside the workplace and thereby possibly contributes to or endangers a sustainable workforce as it is shown that PE fit has important implications for individuals’ mental health, satisfaction and functioning. To explain this link, we draw on the concept of work-family conflict which is key in the work-family interface literature (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Frone et al., 1992) and propose that employees’ experience of work-nonwork boundary management fit influences their satisfaction with and performance in the family domain through the experience of more or less work-family conflict.

**Work-nonwork boundary management fit and work-family conflict**

As grounded in PE fit theory, fit is a satisfactory and motivating state in which employees feel their needs are fulfilled and they can act in correspondence with who they are and want to be (Kristof, 1996). In the specific condition of work-nonwork boundary management, fit can be linked to Frone, Russel and Cooper’s (1992) comprehensive model of the work-family interface that puts forward work-family conflict as a key mechanism through which work experiences (here work-nonwork boundary management fit) affect the quality of an employee’s family life and consequently plays a crucial role in general health and life satisfaction. According to the model, work-family conflict occurs when someone feels that his or her work and family role demands are incompatible and meeting demands in one role makes it difficult to meet demands in the other role (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). When work responsibilities interfere with the family role in a way that family demands cannot be met (i.e., work-family conflict), the quality of the family role may suffer (Frone et al., 1992). We put forward work nonwork boundary management fit as a particular relevant work experiences in this regards because it captures the felt alignment between what an employee considers personally needed to prevent facing such a conflict and what a work setting facilitates and allows in this regard. Experiencing a mismatch or low level of fit cognitively as well as
affectively indicates that the employee is currently not able to attain the boundaries he or she feels needed to combine both life domains which facilitates the occurrence of work-family conflicts (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007).

As work-family conflict can originate from various conditions, two dimensions of conflict are commonly distinguished, i.e. time-based and strain-based conflict (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Time-based conflict occurs when an employee feels that the amount of time devoted to one role makes it harder (or impossible) to participate in the other role (Carlson et al., 2000), whereas strain-based conflict refers to emotional exhaustion experienced in one role that interferes with participation in another role (Carlson et al., 2000). Lacking the supplies needed to create the preferred boundaries may give employees the impression that they have to devote their time between both life domains in another than personally required, meaningful and valued way and thus experience their situation as conflicting in terms of time (Chen et al., 2009). For instance, employees preferring segmentation will prefer uninterrupted time blocks and devoted attention, when they perceive that their work setting prevents them from obtaining these time arrangements at home they will consider this as a time-based conflict. Conversely, employees who experience high levels of fit are able to allocate their time and energy in a way that fits their preferred work-family combination, thereby reducing this type of conflict which was already empirically confirmed by the study of Bogaerts and colleagues (Bogaerts et al., 2018). As for strain, PE fit theory explicitly names stress as the direct result of an experienced lack of correspondence between characteristics of a person and an environment (French, Rodgers, & Cobb, 1974). Experiencing a mismatch (i.e. low levels of work nonwork boundary management fit) necessitates energy and developing coping strategies since fit is a sought-after state. This energy drain will likely translate into strain derived from the work setting and in particular the undesired situation in terms of boundaries that complicates the personal work-home interface whereby felt conflicts may arise. Conversely, an employee perceiving the work setting as meeting its preference (i.e. fit) feels empowered and therefore is less likely to experience strain that may complicate home demands and as such elicit strain-based conflict. Altogether, we
expect work-nonwork boundary management fit to be related to lower levels of both time- and strain-based work-family conflict:

*Hypothesis 1:* Work-nonwork boundary management fit is negatively related to (a) time- and (b) strain-based work-family conflict.

**Work-family conflict impacting family satisfaction and family performance**

Meta-analytical findings already acknowledged that employees who experience low levels of work-family conflict are generally more satisfied with their family role (i.e., family satisfaction) and perform better at home (i.e., family performance) than employees who experience high levels of interrole conflict (e.g., Amstad et al., 2011; Ford, et al., 2007). As mentioned before, the basic rationale behind this relation is that the quality of life in the family domain—and vice versa for family to work conflict (Carlson et al., 2000)—may suffer when employees’ work demands and responsibilities interfere with the enactment of the family role in such a way that important family demands and responsibilities cannot be met (Frone et al., 1992; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). According to Conservation of Resources Theory (Hobfoll, 1989), employees’ only have a fixed amount of resources (e.g. time, mental energy) to spend, so resources exclusively being invested in the work role in case of work-family conflict may result in a lack of necessary resources to fully engage in the family role (Chen et al., 2009; Grandley & Cropanzano, 1999). Conversely, employees who do not experience these conflicting work-family roles (or to a lesser degree) are better able to meet their family demands and are therefore more satisfied and better performing at home (Amstad, et al., 2011; Derks, Bakker, Peters, & van Wingerden, 2016). Yet, different types of work-family conflict may result in (less) favorable family outcomes in various ways (Carlson et al., 2000; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). In this study, we examine the relationship between time- and strain-based work-family conflict and satisfaction with and performance in the family domain; both being important aspects contributing to employees’ overall well-being (Chen et al., 2014; McElwain
et al., 2005; Rupert, Stevanovic, Hartman, Bryant, & Miller, 2012). Whereas family satisfaction refers to employees’ overall affective evaluation of their family life, family performance refers to the fulfillment of expectations and responsibilities that stem from being a family member (e.g., spouse, parent, etc.) and includes both task-related performance (e.g., fulfilling household chores) and relationship-related performance (e.g., providing psychosocial support to family members) (Chen et al., 2014). Both time- and strain-based work-family conflict are expected to influence an employees’ family satisfaction as well as both dimensions of their family performance, in their particular way through the lack of necessary resources.

By definition, time-based work-family conflict reflects a situation in which the amount of time consumed to meet the demands of the work role leaves the employee with too little time resources to comply with the family role demands (Carlson et al., 2000), making it difficult to perform the necessary tasks at home or requiring to change plans, as well as to take the time to really be there and support family members (Edwards & Rothbars, 2000; ref toevoegen voor support). Likewise, not being able to spend enough time with family members due to interfering work matters, can distress employees and result in lower satisfaction with the family role.

As for strain-based work-family conflict, employees experiencing this inter-role conflict are mentally preoccupied with and stressed by meeting the demands of their work role, leaving them with too little mental resources to detach from work matters and be psychologically available to support their family members and concentrate on performing household chores (Carlson et al., 2000; Danner-Vlaardingerbroek, Kluwer, van Steenbergen, & van der Lippe, 2013; Wendsche & Lohmann-Haislah, 2017). Moreover, experiencing difficulties to be mentally available for family members and being present for family matters might disappoint employees and result in lower family satisfaction (Carlson et al., 2000; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Whereas a few previous studies suggested that time-based and strain-based work-family conflict are differently related to family outcomes (e.g., Carlson et al., 2000; Edwards &
Rothbard, 2000), we believe that both types of work-family conflict will be associated to family satisfaction and family performance in the same way, although the underlying arguments slightly differ depending on the lack of time- or strain-related resources. More in particular, we hypothesize that:

**Hypothesis 2:** (a) Time- and (b) strain-based work-family conflict are negatively related to family satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 3:** (a) Time- and (b) strain-based work-family conflict are negatively related to family performance.

**Linking work experiences and family outcomes: The mediating role of work-family conflict**

Research has commonly identified work-family conflict to be a key mechanism between the work and family domain (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). In the model of the work-family interface, Frone and colleagues (1992) proposed that family outcomes are affected by experiences from other roles. For the work domain that is, experiences (both negative and positive) from the work role can boost or thwart the interface between the work and the family roles, thereby impacting satisfaction and performance at home (Ford et al., 2007). Under this framework, employees in a high fitting work environment with respect to their work-nonwork boundary preference can construct their desired work-nonwork boundaries and establish their desired level of work interferring at home, leading to less work-family conflict (Chen et al., 2009) that, in turn, is associated with better family satisfaction and performance. In contrast, employees in a less fitting work environment will experience more work-family conflict because they experience more/less work interferring at home than they prefer (a negative experience) (Chen et al., 2009), leading to lower family satisfaction and performance. In line with the model of the work-family interface, we propose that work-family conflict fully
explains the relation between between work-nonwork boundary management fit and family outcomes (Ford et al., 2007; Frone et al., 1992).

Therefore, we propose two final hypotheses in which we aim to test the mediating role of both time- and strain-based work-family conflict in the relation between work-nonwork boundary management fit and family satisfaction and performance. Moreover, we address the call of Allen and colleagues (2018) to explore the role of time in the work-family interface. We explore the mediating role of time- and strain-based work-family conflict on both the short and long-term by performing two studies using a different time-lag (i.e., one year and one month). In sum, we hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 4:** The relationship between work-nonwork boundary management fit and family satisfaction is mediated through lower (a) time- and (b) strain-based work-family conflict.

**Hypothesis 5:** The relationship between work-nonwork boundary management fit and family performance is mediated through lower (a) time- and (b) strain-based work-family conflict.

**METHOD**

We test these hypotheses in two studies with two different time-lagged samples in order to cross-validate our findings. In both studies we used a different time lag between both waves of data collection in order to examine how these effects develop over time and to reduce common method bias through separation of measures.

**Study 1**
In a first study, work-nonwork boundary management fit and work-family conflict were measured at Time 1 (T1), family satisfaction and performance were measured at Time 2 (T2), one year later. We chose this particular time lag to permit enough time to allow for observed relationships to unfold, in particular the relation between work-family conflict (T1) and family satisfaction and performance (T2). A time lag of 12 months was chosen because a recent meta-study about time in work-family research (Allen, French, Braun, & Fletcher, 2018) noted that this was the most common time lag used in studies including work-family conflict.

Participants and procedure

Participants are working parents with at least one child under the age of 12, indeed combining a family and work role. This particular group is considered a high risk group experiencing more challenges in successfully combining work and family roles and potentially more detrimental effects of an arduous work-family interface (for a meta-analysis, see Byron, 2005). The potential pool of participants was obtained through various Belgian childcare institutions, kindergartens and primary schools. In an email to all parents, we described the nature of the study and assured the participants of the confidentiality of their responses. Participation was voluntarily and respondents had a chance to win a gift-certificate in return for their participation. The survey was part of a broader study regarding individuals’ work-family interface and the estimated time for completion was 40 minutes. A total of 458 individuals returned useable self-report surveys at Time 1. One year later, participants who completed the Time 1 survey were asked to participate in a second survey that assessed family outcomes. A total of 158 respondents completed both questionnaires (T1 and T2), which translated into an effective response rate of 35%, common in this kind of designs (Anseel, Lievens, Schollaert, & Choragwicka, 2010). To rule out non-response bias, we compared responding and nonresponding participants at T1. Using t-tests, we found that respondents did not differ in
terms of gender ($t = -.06, p > .05$), level of perceived work-nonwork boundary management fit ($t = .44, p > .05$), and work-family conflict ($t = -.10, p > .05$).

The majority of the sample was female (88%) and had a cohabiting partner (90%). Respondents had on average two children living in their household ($SD = .91$) and 45% of them worked part-time (i.e., less than 38 hours). Respondents ranged in age from 25 to 51 years with a mean age of 37 years ($SD = 4.72$) and had varying degrees of education: 20% had a secondary-school diploma, 55% had a bachelor’s degree, 24% had a Master’s degree, and 1% had a PhD.

**Measures**

*Work-nonwork boundary management fit.* We used the four-item scale of Bogaerts, De Cooman, and De Gieter (2018) to measure participants’ perception of work-nonwork boundary management fit at T1. Participants were asked to indicate their agreement with four statements, using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Example items include “My need for combining work and private life is met by the opportunities offered by my organization” and “In terms of the way I want to separate work and private life, this job fits me well”. The scale’s Cronbach’s $\alpha$ was .86.

*Work-to-family conflict.* Time and strain-based work-family conflict were measured at T1 using six items developed by Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams (2000), corresponding to Greenhaus and Beutell’s (1985) conceptualization. The measure used a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Sample items are “My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like” (time-based conflict) and “I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family” (strain-based conflict). Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for these scales were .84 and .87 respectively.

*Satisfaction with family life.* At T2, satisfaction with private life was measured with an item used originally by Funk and Rogge (2007). This item was: “Please indicate the degree of happiness, all things considered, with your private life”. Participants were asked to indicate
their degree of happiness using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from extremely unhappy (1) to extremely happy (7).

**Family role performance.** Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they think they fulfill what is expected of them in relation to various aspects of their family life. We used six items of the family role performance scale developed by Chen et al. (2014). This scale consists of two subscales: task-related and relationship-related performance. Example items are: “Do household chores” (task) and “Give advice to family members” (relationship). Items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (do not fulfill expectations at all) to 7 (fulfill expectations completely). The Cronbach’s α was .83.

**Control variables.** Work and home demands were used as control variables in order to prevent the observed relationships to be caused by these variables. We controlled for these variables since the amount of work and home demands were expected to affect employees’ work-family conflict and family satisfaction and performance. In particular, Ilies and colleagues (2007) showed that workload is a strong predictor of employees’ work-family conflict. We measured work demands using the scale of Veldhoven and colleagues (2002). This scale consisted of three items (e.g., “How often do you have to work very fast?”). The Cronbach’s α was .87. We measured home demands with the scale of Peeters, Montgomery, Bakker, and Schaufeli (2005) consisting of three items that refer to quantitative demands at home (e.g., “Do you find that you are busy at home?”). The Cronbach’s α was .79. All control variables were measured at T1. In addition, we controlled for gender and working fulltime or part-time.

**Analyses**

Structural equation modeling (SEM) in Mplus (Muthén & Muthén, 2008) with maximum likelihood estimation was used to evaluate the theorized model. The structural equation modeling method is superior to other available methods (e.g., Baron & Kenny approach) for testing the presumed hypotheses because our variables are unobservable latent
constructs and this method allows for the specification of latent models (Stapleton, 2006). Model fit was evaluated using several goodness of fit indices including the chi-square value ($\chi^2$), the comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). Values of .90 or higher for CLI and TLI and levels below .10 for RMSEA and SRMR indicate that the proposed model fits the data well (Brown, 2006; Hu & Bentler, 1999). First, we evaluated the structure of our measurement model using a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). In a second step, we tested the theoretical model with the structural paths. In order to gain more insight into the mediation-processes, we compared the full mediation model against the partial mediation model. In the full mediation model, work-nonwork boundary management fit was only indirectly related to family satisfaction and performance through time- and strain-based work-family conflict. In the partial mediation model, additional direct paths were allowed between work-nonwork boundary management fit and family outcomes (James, Mulaik, & Brett, 2006). Full mediation occurs when the full mediation model fits the data at least equally well as the partial mediation model, that is, when adding extra direct paths from work-nonwork boundary management fit to family satisfaction and/or performance does not significantly increase model fit (Holmbeck, 1997). Because the full and partial mediation models are nested, $\chi^2$ difference tests were used to compare differences in model fit (Satorra & Bentler, 1994).

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics

Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations across all variables are presented in Table 1. Work-nonwork boundary management fit was positively associated with family satisfaction ($r = .24, p < .01$) and family performance ($r = .23, p < .001$), and negatively with time- and strain-based work-family conflict ($r = -.42, p < .001; r = -.45, p < .001$). Furthermore, family satisfaction was correlated with time- and strain-based work-family conflict ($r = -.21, p$
<.05; \( r = -0.34, p < .001 \)), and family performance was correlated with strain-based work-family conflict (\( r = -0.25, p < .01 \)) in the hypothesized direction. The demographic variables gender and working fulltime were statistically unrelated to the independent and dependent variables in our theorized model and were therefore omitted from further analyses to avoid distortion of the results (Spector & Brannick, 2011).

- Insert Table 1 here -

**Common Method Variance Check**

Because we used self-report measures, we used the CFA marker technique (Williams, Hartman, & Cavazotte, 2010) to test for the presence of common method variance. This approach uses a marker variable in a CFA model to detect common method variance. In our data, we identified task interdependence, measured with a three item scale (\( \alpha = 0.66 \)) developed by Campion, Medsker, and Higgs (1993), as a marker variable. Results of the CFA marker technique indicated that method effects are present, but not problematic. The chi-square difference test between the Baseline model and the Method-C model indicated that the two models were significantly different from one another (\( \chi^2 \text{diff} = 65.97, \Delta df = 1, p < .05 \)). Additionally, a comparison of the Method-C and Method-U model indicated that the impact of the method variable was not equal for all the items in our study (\( \chi^2 \text{diff} = 146.48, \Delta df = 15, p < .05 \)). The Method-U model showed that 8 of the 17 items were contaminated by a source of common method variance captured by the marker variable, with a median value of 0.24. As the square of these values indicates the percentage of variance in the factors associated with the marker variable, the median amount of marker variance in each factor was only 6%. This means that common method variance was not a pervasive problem in our study (Williams et al., 2010).

**Measurement model**
To evaluate the quality of the proposed measurement model, we performed a CFA with maximum likelihood estimation on all items and tested whether they indeed loaded on their intended factor. Corresponding to the original work-nonwork boundary management fit scale from Bogaerts and colleagues (2018), the items that reflect integration and the items that reflect segmentation were permitted to covary because they captured identical content (see Cole, Ciesla, & Steiger, 2007). Also, we allowed a second order structure of family performance reflecting the subscales task-related and relationship-related performance. Our theoretical seven-factor measurement model (MM) including work-nonwork boundary management fit, time-based conflict, strain-based conflict, family satisfaction, family performance, and the control variables work and home demands, yielded a satisfactory model fit: $\chi^2 (212) = 319.67, p < .05$, $CFI = .94$, $TLI = .93$, $RMSEA = .06$, $SRMR = .09$.

We compared this theoretical seven-factor model (MM) to four plausible alternative models: a three-factor model (MM2) with work-nonwork boundary management fit, time-based conflict and strain-based conflict loading on a general factor, family satisfaction and performance loading on a general factor, and work and home demands loading on a general factor, a four-factor model (MM3) with work-nonwork boundary management fit, time-based conflict and strain-based conflict loading on a general factor, family satisfaction and performance loading on a general factor, and both work demands and home demands as separate factors, a five-factor model (MM4) with work-nonwork boundary management fit, time-based conflict and strain-based conflict loading on a general factor and family satisfaction, family performance, work demands and home demands as separate factors, and finally a six-factor model (MM5) with time-based and strain-based conflict loading on a general factor and work-nonwork boundary management fit, family satisfaction, family performance, work demands and home demands. The fit statistics for each model are represented in Table 2.
Overall, each of these alternative models demonstrated a lower fit to the data compared to our theorized measurement model.

- Insert Table 2 here –

**Structural model**

We proposed a mediating model in which the relation between work-nonwork boundary management fit and family satisfaction and performance was explained through time-based and strain-based work-family conflict. This indirect model with paths from work-nonwork boundary management fit to time- and strain-based conflict and paths from time- and strain-based conflict to family satisfaction and performance yielded an acceptable fit to the data: $\chi^2(245) = 371.54, p < .05$, $CFI = .93$, $TLI = .92$, $RMSEA = .06$, $SRMR = .07$. We compared this model to a series of nested models to determine the best fitting model based on the chi-square difference test (Table 3). Structural models (SM) 2 to 5 represent mediated models in which we deleted paths from time- and strain-based conflict to family satisfaction and performance. Chi-square tests show that SM5, in which we deleted paths from time-based conflict to family satisfaction and performance, was significantly better than our hypothesized model (SM1). In addition to testing these alternative models, we also examined a model in which family performance is divided in the underlying dimensions of task performance and relational performance. The result from this supplementary analysis is presented in Appendix 1 (also for study 2).

In a second step, we compared this best-fitting model to the partially mediated models (SM8 and SM9) in which we added direct paths from work-nonwork boundary management fit to family satisfaction and performance. These structural models did not demonstrate a better fit compared to SM5. Therefore, we retained SM5 as the best-fitting model: $\chi^2(215) = 316.26, p < .05$, $CFI = .95$, $TLI = .94$, $RSMEA = .06$, $SRMR = .07$. 
Figure 1 represents the standardized path estimates for the best fitting model. Results demonstrate that work-nonwork boundary management fit relates to less time-based ($\beta = -0.47$, $p < .001$) and less strain-based work-family conflict ($\beta = -0.44$, $p < .001$) (H1a and H1b). Strain-based conflict relates to better family satisfaction ($\beta = -0.40$, $p < .001$) and family performance ($\beta = -0.42$, $p < .001$) (H2b and H3b), whereas time-based conflict is unrelated to family outcomes (H2a and H3a). In a final step, we performed additional tests to verify whether the indirect paths from work-nonwork boundary management fit to family satisfaction and performance through strain-based conflict are significant and strain-based conflict thus mediated this relationship. Following recommendations of Preacher and Hayes (2008), we used bootstrapping ($k = 1000$) to obtain confidence intervals (95%) for the indirect relationship. A statistically significant indirect effect is found when the confidence interval does not contain zero (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). The indirect relationship through strain-based work-family conflict on family satisfaction (H4) (indirect effect (unstandardized) = .12; 95% CI [.04, .22], standard error = 1.04) and family performance (H5) (indirect effect (unstandardized) = .08; 95% CI [.01, .16], standard error = .04) showed to be significant.

Discussion
Results of the structural equations model partially confirmed our theoretical model. Work-nonwork boundary management fit was found to be associated with family satisfaction and performance—exclusively the relationship-related component of family performance, as demonstrated by the supplementary analysis—through strain-based work-family conflict. Although work-nonwork boundary management fit negatively relates to time-based work-
family conflict, this particular type of conflict showed to be unrelated to both family outcomes one year later. In these relations, we controlled for work and home demands.

**Study 2**

With this second study, we reduced the time lag of one year to a time lag of one month with the aim of capturing the more short terms effects hypothesized above. The magnitude of a relation between variables measured at different points in time is likely to vary depending on the amount of time between the measurements as some effects may change or disappear quickly, while others may grow stronger over time (Allen et al., 2018). The failure to detect the mediating role of time-based conflict could thus be because our chosen time lag in Study 1 (one year) was too long (Shipp & Cole, 2015). With this second study, we also addressed some limitations of the first study regarding the single-item measure of family satisfaction and the unequal gender distribution.

**Participants and procedure**

Snowball sampling was used to recruit our respondents by various social media (e.g. Facebook, LinkedIn). Because working parents have to participate in both work and family roles, our inclusion criteria were working at least 80%, not being self-employed and having at least one resident child under the age of 18. In total, 180 respondents filled out the first questionnaire. Four weeks later, 160 respondents completed the second questionnaire, resulting in a response rate of 84%. This response rate is notably higher compared to Study 1 because of the shortened time lag between measurements and shortenend length of the survey. In contrast to Study 1, which was part of a broader study on work-family experiences, this study was exclusively designed to (re)test our hypothesized model. We compared responding and nonresponding participants to rule out non-response bias. Using t-tests, we found that respondents did not differ in terms of gender ($t = -.45, p > .05$), level of perceived work-
nonwork boundary management fit \((t = 1.41, p > .05)\), and work-family conflict \((t = -.91, p > .05)\).

We assured anonymity and no incentives were provided to respondents. Half of the respondents were female (51%) with an average age of 39 years \((SD = 6.92, \text{range: 21-55 years})\). The majority of the respondents had a cohabiting partner (96%) and on average 2 children living in their household \((SD = .88)\). Thirty-four percent of the respondents worked 80% (based on full-time employment of 38 hours) and 83% had a partner who worked at least 30 hours a week. Participants had varying degrees of education: 27% had a secondary-school diploma, 44% had a bachelor’s degree, 25% had a Master’s degree, and 4% had a PhD.

**Measures**

The same scales were used in both studies to measure work-nonwork boundary management fit \((\alpha = .89)\), time-based conflict \((\alpha = .89)\), strain-based conflict \((\alpha = .85)\), family performance \((\alpha = .82)\), work demands \((\alpha = .83)\), and home demands \((\alpha = .89)\). Family satisfaction was measured with three items based on Zabrieskie and Ward (2013). Participants were asked to indicate their agreement with the statements using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Example items include “If I could live my family life over, I would change almost nothing” and “In most ways my family life is close to ideal”. The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .86. Similar to study 1, we controlled for work demands and home demands in order to prevent the observed relationships to be influenced by these variables.

**RESULTS**

Table 4 presents the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations across all variables. Work-nonwork boundary management fit was significantly correlated with time-based conflict \((r = -.52, p < .001)\), strain-based conflict \((r = -.38, p < .001)\), family satisfaction
(r = .31, p < .001), and family performance (r = .43, p < .001) in the expected direction. Time- and strain-based conflict were negatively related to family satisfaction (respectively r = -.38, p < .001 and r = -.34, p < .001) and family performance (respectively r = -.31, p < .001 and r = -.27, p < .01).

- Insert Table 4 here –

**Measurement model**

Similar to study 1, we performed a CFA with maximum likelihood estimation to evaluate the quality of the proposed measurement model. Our original seven-factor measurement model (MMI) including work-nonwork boundary management fit, time-based conflict, strain-based conflict, family satisfaction, family performance, and the control variables work and home demands, yielded a satisfactory model fit: $\chi^2 (250) = 365.43, p < .05, CFI = .95$ $TLI = .95, RMSEA = .05, SRMR = .06$. We compared this theoretical seven-factor model (MM) to four plausible alternative models (the same models as in Study 1, see above). The fit statistics for each model are represented in Table 5. Overall, these alternative models demonstrated a lower fit to the data compared to our theorized measurement model.

- Insert Table 5 here -

**Structural model**

The indirect model with paths from work-nonwork boundary management fit to time- and strain-based conflict and paths from time- and strain-based conflict to family satisfaction and performance yielded an acceptable fit to the data (SM1): $\chi^2 (257) = 387.04, p < .05, CFI = .95, TLI = .94, RMSEA = .06, SRMR = .07$. We compared this model to a series of nested models to determine the best fitting model based on the chi-square difference test (Table 6). SM2 to SM7 represent mediated models in which we deleted paths from time- and strain-based conflict to family satisfaction and performance. Chi-square tests show that our original model (SM1)
was significantly better than the alternative models. In a second step, we compared this best-fitting model to the partially mediated models (SM8 and SM9) in which we added direct paths from work-nonwork boundary management fit to family satisfaction and performance. SM8, with a direct path to family performance, was significantly better than SM1. Therefore, we retained SM8 as the best-fitting model: \( \chi^2(256) = 379.62, p < .05, \text{CFI} = .95, \text{TLI} = .94, \text{RSMEA} = .06, \text{SRMR} = .07. \)

Figure 2 represents the standardized path estimates for the best fitting model. Results demonstrate that work-nonwork boundary management fit relates to less time-based (\( \beta = -.60, p < .001 \)) and less strain-based work-family conflict (\( \beta = -.43, p < .001 \)) (H1a and H1b). Time-based conflict then relates to better family satisfaction (\( \beta = -.30, p < .001 \)) (H2a), but not to family performance (H3a), and strain-based conflict is unrelated to family outcomes (H2b and H3b). In addition, we found a direct effect between work-nonwork boundary management fit and family performance (\( \beta = .44, p < .001 \)) (H5). In a final step, we performed an additional test to verify whether the indirect path from work-nonwork boundary management fit to family satisfaction through time-based conflict is significant and time-based conflict thus mediated this relationship. The indirect relationship through time-based work-family conflict on family satisfaction (indirect effect (unstandardized) = .20; 95% CI [.06, .36], standar error = .08) indeed showed to be significant (H4).

Discussion

Results of the structural equations model partially confirmed our theoretical model, but revealed different relations compared to Study 1. In contrast to the first study, work-nonwork boundary management fit was found to be associated with family satisfaction through time-based work-family conflict. Although work-nonwork boundary management fit relates to less
strain-based work-family conflict, this particular type of conflict showed to be unrelated to both family outcomes in the second study. Results of this second study show the importance of time in studying the effect of work-family conflict and reveal different short- and long-term effects of time- and strain based conflict. In these relations, we controlled for work and home demands.

**DISCUSSION**

In this paper we examine how employees’ person-environment (PE) fit with regard to managing their work-nonwork boundaries influences their personal life off the job, and aim to contribute to the understanding on how to create a sustainable work-family interface and in extention a sustainable workforce. More in particular, we tested how work-nonwork boundary management fit relates to family satisfaction and performance through the experience of time- and strain-based work-family conflict. Drawing on PE fit Theory (Kristof, 1996) and Boundary Theory (Nippert-Eng, 1996) we argued that perceiving work-nonwork boundary management fit results in lower levels of work-family conflict as employees are able to balace both roles in congruence with their personal preference to do so, and consequently improves employees’ satisfaction and performance at home. The underlying reasoning has been used in previous research on the work-family interface (Ford et al., 2007), however our study marks the first attempt to incorporate both attitudinal and behavioral family outcomes of work-family PE fit experiences. Outcomes that together to a significant extent constitue general health and life satisfaction We combined two studies differing in temporal lag and examined the different mediating roles of two types of work family conflict (e.g., time- and strain-based conflict). Results from our studies revealed that work-nonwork boundary management fit indeed relates to family satisfaction and performance (partially, and exclusively to the relationship-related dimension of family performance) through its impact on work-family conflict. Interestingly, the (mediating) effect of the time- and strain-based dimensions of work-family conflict differs
depending on the temporal lag between the conflict and family outcomes measurement. In particular, in our first study, results show that work-nonwork boundary management fit negatively relates to family satisfaction and performance one year later through strain-based conflict. Time-based conflict was unrelated to family satisfaction and performance one year later. In our second study, results demonstrate a mediating effect of time-based conflict in the relation between work-nonwork boundary management fit and family satisfaction one month later and a direct effect of work-nonwork boundary management fit on family performance. Thus, it appears that work-nonwork boundary management fit has a short-term effect on family outcomes (and family satisfaction in particular) through time-based work-family conflict, whereas the mediating effect of strain-based conflict evolves more slowly across time. These findings align with stress models suggesting that various stress reactions take more time to develop (Sonnentag & Frese, 2003). In addition, the direct effect between work-nonwork boundary management fit and family performance (with a one month time lag) indicates that employees can better fulfill their family responsibilities when the organizational work-family supplies are congruent to the employees’ preference for setting boundaries because the work environment helps employees in establishing their desired level of interruptions by the work domain while they are at home.

Contributions

Our study contributes to the debate on stimulating a sustainable workforce and the research literature in several ways. First, our study contributes to the knowledge on how to create, support and maintain a harmonious life-long work-family interface, as one of the factors contributing to a sustainable workforce (Kossek et al., 2014). By examining the possible work-family spillover mechanism via work-nonwork boundary management fit and (time- and strain-based) work-family conflict, we demonstrated the importance of employees’ experiencing fit between the work-family practices offered by their employer and the organizational culture and
their own boundary management preference in trying to reduce unfavorable spillover from employees’ work experiences to their personal lives. In doing so, we support the idea that the same set of uniform work-family support policies and/or a strong organizational culture will not have the expected favorable effect on the work-family interface of every individual employee, and that organizations should take employees’ personal preferences into account when trying to support them with balancing work and family roles and share habits and norms (Daniel & Sonnentag, 2016; Kelly et al., 2008). Second, we contribute to the PE fit literature (Kristof, 1996) by extending the concept of fit to the domain of the work-family interface and demonstrating the role and added value of fit between employees’ personal preference with regard to boundary management and the offered work-family support policies by their employer in understanding the impact of the work role on employees’ well-being and functioning outside the work domain (i.e., family satisfaction and performance). As such, our findings supplement those of previous research on work-nonwork boundary management fit demonstrating its impact on various outcomes in the work domain (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention; Bogaerts et al., 2018).

Third, we consolidate the key role of work-family conflict in the work-family interface literature, in accordance with previous findings and models of Frone and colleagues (1992) and Ford and colleagues (2007). We add to the knowledge on work-family conflict by demonstrating the importance of considering the different types of work-family conflict (Carlson et al., 2000; here time- and strain-based work-family conflict). Corroborating the assumptions of Edwards and Rothbard (2000), it seems likely that different mechanisms drive these different types of conflict and that these different conflict types thus have different outcomes (Chen et al., 2009). Whereas Edwards and Rothbard (2000) suggested that time-based conflict relates to family performance and strain-based conflict relates to family satisfaction, our results indicate that it is rather the temporal effect of these different dimensions that drives
outcomes. It seems that work-nonwork boundary management fit has a short-term effect on family outcomes (and family satisfaction in particular) through time-based work-family conflict, whereas the mediating effect of strain-based conflict develops more slowly across time. This corroborates with Allen and colleagues’ suggestion (2018) that the magnitude of a relation is likely to vary depending on the amount of time between the measurements, since some effects may change or disappear quickly while others may need more time to develop. Moreover, this study also adds to our understanding of antecedents of work-family conflict. Employees’ work demands have been identified as a strong predictor of work-family conflict (Byron, 2005). In this study, work-nonwork boundary management fit was found to be related to work-family conflict, above and beyond the effect of work (and home) demands, with the effect of this particular type of fit being stronger than the effect of work demands, especially for time-based work-family conflict. These results allign with the findings of Bogaerts et al. (2018).

**Practical contributions**

Employees tend to attach more and more importance to finding a healthy interface between their work and family domain, so it is highly advisable for organizations to support employees in their efforts in this regard and stimulate more sustainable work. Previous studies have already shown that organizations must try to better match their work-family support policies, practices and organizational culture with employees’ boundary preference, rather than merely adopting one-size-fits-all policies and practices (e.g., Bogaerts et al., 2018; Rothbard, et al., 2005). The perception of work-nonwork boundary management fit may be interesting to look at in more than one way. Not only may this experience of fit increase employees’ well-being in the workplace, it also makes them happier and better performing at home, contributing to their general health and life satisfaction. Organizations can gain competitive advantage in
terms of attracting and retaining top talent employees by taking into account this particular perception of fit and attuning the work setting to the preferences and needs of employees.

**Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

Despite several strengths, this research has some limitations. First, although our hypothesized relationships suggest directionality, we were not able to make any define claims about causality based on our time-lagged research designs. To gain more insight into the directionality of the relationships, future research should apply a longitudinal study design with multiple measurement points. A second limitation concerns the nature of our data. The use of self-report measures might raise concerns in terms of common-method bias. However, we took several precautions to minimize common method variance, such as temporal separation of the measures and protecting respondent anonymity (Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007) and we statistically demonstrated that common method variance is not an inherent problem. Moreover, meta-analyses that compared cross-sectional with longitudinal designs do not uniformly find larger correlations in the cross-sectional designs (Spector, 2019), indicating that variables measured at the same time do not automatically show higher correlations. Overall, we believe that our results are not endangered by common method bias. We are convinced that, given the perceptual and subjective nature of our constructs (i.e., work-nonwork boundary management fit, work-family conflict and satisfaction), using self-report data was appropriate for the objectives of our study as these psychological experiences and attitudinal evaluations are best reported by the employees themselves. Third, in this study, we examined the separate role of time- and strain-based conflict because these are the most common forms of work-family conflict (Powell & Greenhaus, 2006). Yet, work-family conflict can also be behavior-based (i.e., when behaviors required in one role are incompatible with expected behaviors in the other role) (Carlson et al., 2000). Edwards and Rothbard (2000) suggest that behavior that is transferred from one domain inhibits performance in another domain. Therefore, future research
could also look at all this third component of conflict and how it relates to antecedents and outcomes. The final limitation relates to the temporal lags applied in our studies. In Study 1, we opted for a time lag of one year because meta-analytical findings of Allen and colleagues (2018) identified 12 months as being the most common time lag in work-family research. In our second study, we shortened this time lag to one month to examine the short-term relations. However, the choice of time lag should be theory-driven, rather than being a methodological choice (Shipp & Cole, 2015). Unfortunately, until now, there is no single correct time lag that can be applied to work-family studies (Allen et al., 2018). Future research should thus consider the duration of phenomena and focus on the amount of time between the beginning and the end of an effect (Shipp & Cole, 2015).

**Conclusion**

The findings of these two related studies emphasize the relevance of experiencing congruence between one’s preference for setting work-nonwork boundaries and work-family supplies offered by a work setting. Not only may this experience of fit increase employee well-being in the workplace, it also makes them happier and better performing at home. Therefore, work-nonwork boundary management fit is to be taken into account when trying to establish a harmonious work-family interface as part of creating a sustainable workforce. Specifically, our findings reveal that work-nonwork boundary management fit relates to family satisfaction and performance, (partially) through time- and strain-based work-family conflict. Interestingly, the effect of different dimensions of conflict differs depending on the temporal lag between work-family conflict and family outcomes. In general, our findings suggest that work and family experiences are linked through work-family conflict, with the temporal effect being different for different dimensions of conflict.
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### Table 1. Means, standard deviations and intercorrelations Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Working fulltime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work demands</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-2.24*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Home demands</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-2.25**</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WNW boundary management fit</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-2.25**</td>
<td>-1.16*</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Time-based conflict</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-0.42***</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Strain-based conflict</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-0.45***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Family satisfaction</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The table represents Pearson correlations. N = 158. Gender: 1 = Male, 0 = Female. Working fulltime: 1 = full time, 0 = part time. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

WNW = work-nonwork

### Table 2. Fit statistics for the measurement models Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CLI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>319.67</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>MM2-MM1</td>
<td>556.92</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM2</td>
<td>876.59</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>MM3-MM1</td>
<td>421.93</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM3</td>
<td>741.60</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>MM4-MM1</td>
<td>194.83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4</td>
<td>514.50</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>MM5-MM1</td>
<td>96.65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM5</td>
<td>416.32</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>MM5-MM1</td>
<td>26.65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Best fitting model in italics. MM represents our theoretical 7-factor model.

### Table 3. Structural equation models of Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM1: Hypothesized mediated model</td>
<td>315.97</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Model 2 to Model 1</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM2: Without paths from SC to FP and FS</td>
<td>331.54</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Model 2 to Model 1</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM3: Including a path from SC to FP</td>
<td>328.68</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Model 3 to Model 1</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM4: Including a path from SC to FS</td>
<td>324.07</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Model 4 to Model 1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM5: Without paths from TC to FP and FS</td>
<td>316.26</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Model 5 to Model 1</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM6: Including a direct path from BMF to FP</td>
<td>315.43</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Model 6 to Model 5</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM7: Including a direct path from BMF to FS</td>
<td>315.71</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Model 7 to Model 5</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. When the $\Delta \chi^2$ was significant, the model with less degrees of freedom was chosen. When the $\Delta \chi^2$ was not significant, the model with more degrees of freedom was chosen. The best fitting model is marked in italics.

TC = time-based conflict; SC = strain-based conflict, BMF = work-nonwork boundary management fit, FP = family performance, FS = family satisfaction.
Table 4. Means, standard deviations and intercorrelations Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Working fulltime</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work demands</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Home demands</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-.46***</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WNW boundary management fit</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Time-based conflict</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.52***</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Strain-based conflict</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td>-.50***</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Family satisfaction</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Family performance</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The table represents Pearson correlations. N = 158. Gender: 1 = Male, 0 = Female. Working fulltime: 1 = full time, 0 = part time. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
WNW = work-nonwork

Table 5. Fit statistics for the measurement models Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CLI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Δχ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>365.43</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>MM2-MM1</td>
<td>928.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM2</td>
<td>1293.93</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>MM2-MM1</td>
<td>928.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM3</td>
<td>944.78</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>MM3-MM1</td>
<td>579.35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4</td>
<td>569.87</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>MM4-MM1</td>
<td>204.44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM5</td>
<td>512.88</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>MM5-MM1</td>
<td>147.45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Best fitting model in italics. MM represents our theoretical 7-factor model.

Table 6. Structural equation models of Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Δχ²</th>
<th>Δdf</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM1: Hypothesized mediated model</td>
<td>387.04</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>Model 2 to Model 1</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM2: Without paths from SC to FP and FS</td>
<td>391.91</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>Model 3 to Model 1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM3: Including a path from SC to FP</td>
<td>390.37</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Model 4 to Model 1</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM4: Including a path from SC to FS</td>
<td>390.34</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Model 5 to Model 1</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM5: Without paths from TC to FP and FS</td>
<td>400.65</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>Model 6 to Model 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM6: Without a path from SC to TP</td>
<td>396.04</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Model 7 to Model 1</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM7: Without a path from TC to FS</td>
<td>396.79</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Model 8 to Model 1</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM8: Including a direct path from BMF to FP</td>
<td>379.62</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>Model 9 to Model 8</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM9: Including a direct path from BMF to FS</td>
<td>378.66</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>Model 10 to Model 8</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. When the Δχ² was significant, the model with less degrees of freedom was chosen. When the Δχ² was not significant, the model with more degrees of freedom was chosen. The best fitting model is marked in italics.
TC = time-based conflict; SC = strain-based conflict, BMF = work-nonwork boundary management fit, FP = family performance, FS = family satisfaction.
Figure 1. Structural model of Study 1.
Note: Coefficients represent standardized coefficients. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.

Figure 2. Structural model of Study 2.
Note: Coefficients represent standardized coefficients. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
APPENDIX 1 - Supplementary analyses separating family performance dimensions

Figure 1. Additional analysis separating family performance into family task performance and relationship performance in Study 1
Note: Coefficients represent standardized coefficients. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.

Figure 2. Additional analysis separating family performance into family task performance and relationship performance in Study 2
Note: Coefficients represent standardized coefficients. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
Table 1. Fit statistics for the supplementary models separating family performance into family task performance and relationship performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CLI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study 1</td>
<td>311.63</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 2</td>
<td>371.31</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>