University of Groningen

Help or hindrance? Day-level relationships between flextime use, work-nonwork boundaries, and affective well-being

Spieler, Ines; Scheibe, Susanne; Stamov-Roßnagel, Christian; Kappas, Arvid

Published in:
Journal of Applied Psychology

DOI:
[10.1037/apl0000153](https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000153)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Spieler, I., Scheibe, S., Stamov-Roßnagel, C., & Kappas, A. (2017). Help or hindrance? Day-level relationships between flextime use, work-nonwork boundaries, and affective well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(1), 67-87. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000153>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Help or Hindrance? Day-Level Relationships Between Flextime Use, Work–Nonwork Boundaries, and Affective Well-Being

Ines Spieler
Jacobs University Bremen

Susanne Scheibe
University of Groningen

Christian Stamov-Roßnagel and Arvid Kappas
Jacobs University Bremen

Flexible working time arrangements are becoming increasingly popular around the globe, but do they actually benefit employees? To address this question, we take a differentiated look at employees' day-specific use of flextime and its effect on the intersection of work and nonwork life. Specifically, we examined whether links between day-specific flextime use and affective well-being at work and at home can be explained by *level of goal completion* and the subjective boundaries around one's work and private life domains (i.e., the *strength of work–nonwork boundaries*). During 2 consecutive workweeks, 150 bank employees from various functions (Study 1) and a heterogeneous sample of 608 employees (Study 2) reported their day-specific use of flextime, boundary strength at work and home, and affective well-being in the evening and the next day. Multilevel structural equation modeling of 2,223 (Study 1) and 3,164 (Study 2) observations revealed that flextime use was associated with stronger boundaries at home in both studies and stronger boundaries at work in Study 2. Stronger boundaries were, in turn, positively associated with affective well-being, both in the same evening and the next day. Study 2 further revealed that day-specific nonwork goal completion mediated the positive association between daily flextime use and boundary strength at work. However, whereas occasional flextime use had unequivocal positive consequences, chronic flextime use undermined the completion of work goals. Overall, findings suggest that flextime use benefits employees when used in moderation.

Keywords: workplace flexibility, work–nonwork interface, emotions, experience sampling, life domain borders

Social, technological, and demographic changes and the high share of women in the labor market have increased both work and nonwork demands (Costa et al., 2003). Work–home interference resulting from such competing demands can diminish employees' long-term physical and mental health (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1997), which is an important determinant of work engagement and performance (Bakker & Leiter, 2010; Wright, Bonett, & Sweeney, 1993). Consequently, reconciling competing work and nonwork demands has become one of the most critical challenges organizations, employees, and families face (Drobníć & Rodríguez

Guillén, 2011). Many organizations have become aware of the needs of contemporary families and have responded with family friendly policies, such as flexible working time arrangements. The availability of such arrangements has increased considerably since 1985 (McMenamin, 2007). In Germany, depending on the industry sector, between 27.9% and 40.2% of employers offer the option to adapt daily work start and end times (Eurofound, 2013). Similar shares of employees have access to temporal workplace flexibility across the European Union (Eurofound, 2013) and the U.S. (Matos & Galinsky, 2014). Consequently, considerable research has addressed the effects of flexible working time arrangements on organizations, families, and employees (Kossek & Michel, 2011).

Prior findings on the relationship between flextime and well-being have been inconsistent. Several studies suggest that being able to flexibly arrange working hours has positive effects on well-being and health (e.g., Costa, Sartori, & Akerstedt, 2006), work–life balance (see Albertsen, Rafnsdóttir, Grimsø, Tomasson, & Kauppinen, 2008, for a review), performance, absenteeism, and job satisfaction (see Baltes, Briggs, Huff, Wright, & Neuman, 1999, for a meta-analysis). However, some research points to downsides of workplace flexibility such as work intensification and involuntary working time extensions (Pickshaus, Schmitthenner, & Urban, 2001). Results are inconsistent in particular regarding the impact of workplace flexibility on the work–nonwork interface, most commonly operationalized through work–

This article was published Online First September 12, 2016.

Ines Spieler, Department of Psychology and Methods, Jacobs University Bremen; Susanne Scheibe, Department of Psychology, University of Groningen; Christian Stamov-Roßnagel and Arvid Kappas, Department of Psychology and Methods, Jacobs University Bremen.

This study is based on parts of Ines Spieler's doctoral dissertation. The research was funded by the Bremen International Graduate School of Social Sciences and the University of Groningen. Parts of the data were presented at the Work and Family Researchers Network Conference in New York, NY, June 19–21 in 2014.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ines Spieler, Department of Psychology and Methods, Jacobs University Bremen, Campus Ring 1, 28759 Bremen, Germany. E-mail: ispieler@bigsss-bremen.de

home interference (see Allen, Johnson, Kiburz, & Shockley, 2013, for a meta-analysis). Overall, it is currently unclear whether flextime actually benefits employees, and the pathways through which flextime relates to processes at the work–nonwork interface are ill-understood. Understanding this relationship is important both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, it is important to clarify the nature of the relationship between flextime and employee well-being and delineate the underlying mechanisms to better understand why flextime can help or hinder employees' well-being. Practically, organizations need to know whether flextime policies actually benefit their employees in order to effectively support their workforce.

The present work tries to contribute to this understanding by extending prior research in three ways. First, going beyond studies that focused on the *availability* of flextime, we look at the actual *use* of flextime and its impact on the work–nonwork interface, the completion of work and nonwork goals, and the associated well-being consequences. Second, we treat flextime use as a dynamic process and employ an experience-sampling approach to investigate the daily dynamics between flextime use, work–nonwork boundary strength, goal completion, and affective well-being. Finally, we use boundary theory (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000) and social–cognitive theories of goal regulation (Carver & Scheier, 1981; Masicampo & Baumeister, 2011a) to propose and test work–nonwork boundary strength and goal completion as mechanisms underlying the relationships between flextime use and affective well-being. Hereby, we contribute to a better understanding of *how and why* flextime use relates to employee well-being.

Defining Flextime Use

Hill et al. (2008) define workplace flexibility as “the ability of workers to make choices influencing when, where, and for how long they engage in work-related tasks” (p. 152). Flexplace, referring to work location flexibility, can be distinguished from flextime, referring to work scheduling flexibility (Allen et al., 2013). In the current research, we focus on flextime, which implies employees' autonomous handling of start, end, and break times according to their needs (Kattenbach, Demerouti, & Nachreiner, 2010). The concept of flextime can refer to any working time arrangement deviating from a traditional nine-to-five, 5-day-a-week office-only schedule. In its most restricted form, flextime is characterized by a preset time range defining when employees may arrive in the morning (e.g., from 7 a.m. to 9 a.m.) and leave in the evening (e.g., from 3 p.m. to 6 p.m.). Employees are still required to clock in and out, work about the same number of hours every day, and take breaks at clearly defined times. In its most extreme form, flextime is characterized by the absence of managerial control over working hours, sometimes even of contractually fixed working hours or vacation days. This type of flextime (referred to as trust-based working time arrangement) usually implies high spatial flexibility (e.g., employees work [partly] from home) and a shift toward pure results orientation. A results orientation means that the outcomes of one's work are evaluated, irrespective of the time spent at work (i.e., face-time).

Extant research has not systematically distinguished between *availability* and actual *use* of flextime (cf. Allen et al., 2013; Kelly et al., 2008). Instead, there appears to be an implicit assumption that employees generally use the flextime options available to

them. However, not all employees working under flextime adapt their work times flexibly, for example because individual preferences, family responsibilities, or the prospect of having to coordinate with colleagues and family members prevents them from doing so. We conceptualize flextime availability as employees' control over working times, aka the possibility to deviate from a default nine-to-five, 5-day-a-week schedule. We conceptualize flextime use as employees' actual enactment of that control, also known as the degree to which they adapt their working and break times according to their needs (e.g., starting to work when it fits them best). Thomas and Ganster (1995) have shown that flextime availability has beneficial effects on work–nonwork interference and well-being through the perception of schedule control. Yet, little is known about the effects of actually using flextime. In a recent meta-analysis on workplace flexibility, Allen, Johnson, Kiburz, and Shockley (2013) report that the effects of flextime use on work interference with home were addressed in only six out of 188 samples and its effects on home interference with work in only four out of 104 samples. Yet, flextime availability and use turned out to be differentially related to work–nonwork interference (Allen et al., 2013). Research that neglects flextime use may therefore draw a distorted picture as not all employees use their flextime options.

Moreover, researchers have mostly adopted a static perspective on workplace flexibility as a formal human resource policy that employees might have access to. This may be appropriate when focusing on flextime availability. However, flextime use likely undergoes daily fluctuations. Most employees working under flextime arrangements will have a standard temporal routine in place on most days, but flexibly change this routine in response to special work or nonwork demands. For example, they may on some days accompany an older relative to the doctor before work, take an extra break to call the children's teacher, or finish work early to pick up a sick toddler from the nursery; and thereby deviate from their default working time. Likewise, an employee may occasionally start earlier, cut breaks, or stay longer to cover for a sick colleague, finish an unexpectedly time-consuming task, or meet a deadline. In other words, employees may not use flextime to the same extent every single day.

Because flextime use can undergo daily fluctuations, traditional cross-sectional studies may miss substantial portions of the variance in the outcomes of flextime use. In the current study, we employed the experience-sampling methodology to investigate how day-specific *fluctuations* in the *use* of flextime impact processes at the work–nonwork interface on a daily basis. Experience sampling can measure situational consequences of flextime use as they unfold at the work–nonwork interface and its affective consequences with little retrospective bias (see Bakker, 2014, for an overview). Moreover, this method allows for comparing relationships between the within-person and between-person levels to test if short-term benefits or costs of daily flextime use are comparable to those of chronic flextime use.

Work–Nonwork Boundary Strength

Boundary theory (Ashforth et al., 2000) explains the interaction between work and family (also called nonwork or home) domains. Work and family are viewed as two distinct life domains associated with distinct roles, which are demarcated by cognitive, be-

havioral, or temporal boundaries that employees cross daily as they transit between work and nonwork roles. Boundaries differ in strength, as indicated by the number of interdomain transitions. An interdomain transition is a cognitive or behavioral transition made from one life domain to another (Matthews, Barnes-Farrell, & Bulger, 2010, p. 449), for instance, when an employee thinks about work-related problems at home or calls the children's teacher from work. Employees who generally have weak boundaries do not distinguish between work and nonwork and experience frequent interdomain transitions. In contrast, employees with strong boundaries tend to keep work and nonwork apart and experience few interdomain transitions (Voydanoff, 2005).¹

Importantly, earlier research on the person-level has shown that work and nonwork boundaries can be asymmetrical: Some employees' work issues rarely creep into home life (strong boundaries at home) but their family related issues may regularly infiltrate their work life (weak boundaries at work). For most employees, the boundary at work is significantly stronger than the boundary at home (Janke, Stamov-Roßnagel, & Scheibe, 2014). The utility of distinguishing boundaries by direction is further supported by evidence on their different correlates. Hecht and Allen (2009) showed that the strength of the boundary at home (but not work) is negatively related to overtime and organizational availability norms, but positively related to employees' preferences for a strong boundary at home. In contrast, the strength of the boundary at work (but not home) is positively related to employees' identification with the job role, but negatively related to identification with the home life role. Bulger, Matthews, and Hoffman (2007) further showed that a weak boundary at home tends to be related to work interference with home, whereas a weak boundary at work tends to be related to home interference with work (see also Clark, 2002).

As for temporal workplace flexibility, it can be assumed that the strength of work–nonwork boundaries fluctuates from day to day along with variations in work and nonwork demands. For example, when an urgent work demand arises (e.g., a deadline, sickness cover), more interdomain transitions may occur (i.e., boundaries will be weaker) because employees may take work-related thoughts and tasks into their nonwork life. Thus, independent of one's average boundary strength, on busy days work issues might creep into nonwork life (weak boundaries at home), while nonwork issues stay at home (strong boundaries at work). In fact, Sonnentag and colleagues have repeatedly shown that the strength of the boundary at home (operationalized as psychological detachment from work) varies on a daily basis (Sonnentag, 2012). In sum, previous research on person-level differences in work–nonwork boundary strength and our conceptual elaborations support the utility of investigating work and home boundary characteristics separately and on a daily basis.

Effects of Flextime Use on Daily Work–Nonwork Boundary Strength

What happens to daily work–nonwork boundaries when employees make more or less use of flextime? A review of the mostly cross-sectional literature advocates the possibility of both positive and negative effects (Allen, Cho, & Meier, 2014), but the impact of *day-specific* flextime use has not been investigated. We assume that using flextime allows employees to pursue multiple goals in

different life domains. The influence on daily work–nonwork boundaries, however, will depend on how flextime relates to goal conflict and goal completion.

Why Flextime Would Weaken Daily Work–Nonwork Boundaries

Döhl, Kratzer, and Sauer (2000) claim that flextime fosters the “de-bordering” of work through enhanced interdomain transitions and because work–nonwork boundaries seem to be less well defined: Employees have the discretion to call their child's teacher or check the news during the work day. They do not have to take a day off to take a relative to the doctor's during the day, but work longer hours instead to get their work finished. Flextime use may therefore lead to more transitions which activates simultaneously or in short alternation competing goals in different life domains.

However, as people cannot pursue all their goals simultaneously, they need to prioritize some goals (Gollwitzer, Heckhausen, & Steller, 1990; Maes & Gebhardt, 1999) and may experience *goal conflict* when pursuing one goal hinders the pursuit of another goal (Emmons, King, & Sheldon, 1993). For example, playing with one's child hinders the work goal to finish an urgent report. While pursuing the primary goal, the competing goal is put on hold, keeps lingering in the background (Masicampo & Baumeister, 2011a; Zeigarnik, 1927) and tends to intrude one's thoughts and attention (Zeigarnik, 1927). Consequently, people experiencing goal conflict have been shown to be more ruminative (Baethge & Rigotti, 2013; Boudreaux & Ozer, 2013). Rumination about nonwork goals during work time (or vice versa) is by definition incompatible with strong work–nonwork boundaries. Consistent with these assumptions is Schieman and Young's (2010) evidence of positive relations between flextime and frequent alternation between work and nonwork goals. Additionally, Matthews, Barnes-Farrell, and Bulger (2010) report positive relationships between the option to work flexibly and the number of work-to-family transitions. Although the effects of flextime (use) on the work–nonwork interface have not yet been investigated at the within-person level, the same processes are likely to operate in daily variations of flextime use. On that background, it seems plausible that day-specific flextime use will be negatively related to boundary strengths at work and at home.

¹ Note that work–nonwork boundaries have been investigated under many different labels including permeability (Clark, 2002), work-to-family transition (Matthews et al., 2010), cross-role interruption behaviors (Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, & Hannum, 2012), role referencing (Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2006), integration/segmentation enactment (Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006), role blurring (Desrochers, Hilton, & Larwood, 2005), psychological detachment from work (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007), work–family internal conflict (Carlson & Frone, 2003), actual segmentation of the work domain from the family domain (Powell & Greenhaus, 2010), spillover (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000), and rumination (Cropley & Purvis, 2003; see also Allen et al., 2014, for an overview). In this study, we adopted the well-established term boundary strength as it traditionally distinguishes boundary strength by life domain and is rooted in border/boundary theory (Ashforth et al., 2000) which has guided our study and hypothesis development. Yet, we include findings regarding the related concepts in our literature review.

Why Flextime Would Strengthen Daily Work–Nonwork Boundaries

Alternatively, it is plausible that flextime use lets employees schedule their daily activities in line with work and nonwork demands (Kossek & Michel, 2011). This may help them finish one task before starting another, thus fostering *goal completion* and diminishing goal conflict. For example, with fixed working times, employees may need to stop pursuing work goals before they are completed. Using flextime, in contrast, allows employees to go home when their work is finished, independent of the hours worked that day, or resolve a family issue over lunch before resuming work. Once goals are completed, they are deactivated in memory (Marsh, Hicks, & Bink, 1998) so that employees can “leave behind” the respective life domain when transitioning back to the other domain, which should be associated with stronger work–nonwork boundaries. Consistently, Byron’s (2005) meta-analysis found flextime to be associated with stronger work–nonwork boundaries as indicated by reduced work–family conflicts (see also Allen et al., 2013; Rothbard, Phillips, & Dumas, 2005). In sum, one could assume that day-specific flextime use will be positively related to work–nonwork boundary strength. Considering the two ways in which flextime use could affect work–nonwork boundaries, we formulate the following alternative hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Day-specific use of flextime is negatively associated at the within-person level with the strength of boundaries at (a) work and (b) home.

Hypothesis 2: Day-specific use of flextime is positively associated at the within-person level with the strength of boundaries at (a) work and (b) home.

Effects of Work–Nonwork Boundary Strength on Affective Well-Being

How are work–nonwork boundaries, in turn, related to affective well-being? The control theory of behavior (Carver & Scheier, 1990) posits that people automatically monitor progress toward their goals. When goals are attained or sufficient progress is made, they experience positive affect; otherwise, affect will be negative. Weak work–nonwork boundaries involve frequent interdomain transitions, also known as the simultaneous activation of conflicting goals from both life domains (Rothbard & Ramarajan, 2009). However, because only one focal goal can be pursued at a time, other goals remain in a state of failure until opportunities arise to pursue them. Such incomplete goals occupy cognitive resources and thus impede progress on the focal goal (Masicampo & Baumeister, 2011b). According to Carver and Scheier (1990), this should increase negative affect and diminish positive affect. In contrast, strong work–nonwork boundaries go along with few transitions and the deactivation of goals from the other life domain. Focal goals are therefore shielded from goal conflict, in which case cognitive resources can be fully devoted to goals from the current life domain. This reduces the likelihood of goal failure and increases the likelihood of goal attainment (Masicampo & Baumeister, 2011b), leading to the absence of negative affect and the enhancement of positive affect (Carver & Scheier, 1990).

While early research suggests that strong boundaries can have both costs and benefits for well-being (Ashforth et al.,

2000), most evidence suggests that strong boundaries yield positive outcomes. Research at the person-level (Etzion, Eden, & Lapidot, 1998) as well as at the day-level (Sonnentag, 2012) demonstrated positive effects of strong boundaries at home on affective well-being. Sonnentag and Bayer (2005) found in a diary study that employees reported more positive affect during nonwork time on days when they managed to detach more from work. Sonnentag, Binnewies, and Mojza (2008) demonstrated that the positive effect of strong boundaries at home on affective well-being can last until the next morning before work. This is relevant because we also suggest that the effect of work–nonwork boundary strength lasts overnight and might impact affective well-being the next day. Another diary study demonstrated boundary strength at work operationalized as detachment from home to be associated with better work performance and reduced home interference with work (Sanz-Vergel, Demerouti, Bakker, & Moreno-Jimenez, 2011). Although it was not tested explicitly, one can assume that strong boundaries at work should also benefit affective well-being. In sum, most day-level studies, along with the control theory of behavior (Carver & Scheier, 1990), suggest a beneficial impact of strong boundaries on affective well-being. Therefore, we posit:

Hypothesis 3: Day-specific boundary strength at work is related to more positive and less negative affect (a) in the evening and (b) the next day.

Hypothesis 4: Day-specific boundary strength at home is related to more positive and less negative affect (a) in the evening and (b) the next day.

As mentioned above, day-specific fluctuations in flextime use can have a positive or a negative impact on boundary strength. When boundaries are weak, more interdomain transitions occur such that multiple roles and goals are activated simultaneously or in short alternation (Rothbard & Ramarajan, 2009). As not all activated goals can be pursued at a time, some goals are put on hold, using cognitive resources that cannot be directed at the current focal goal (Masicampo & Baumeister, 2011b). Stronger negative and diminished positive affect will be the result (Carver & Scheier, 1990). Accordingly, the relationship between flextime use and affective well-being is likely mediated by day-specific work–nonwork boundaries. Employees’ day-specific flextime use will impact the strength of boundaries (in a positive or negative way), and stronger boundaries will in turn be associated with more favorable affective well-being in the same evening and the next day (see Figure 1 for the research model of Study 1). We expect a partial mediation of boundary strength, given that there may be further mediating mechanisms. For example, flextime use allows employees to adjust their work time when fatigued (e.g., come in later, leave earlier, or take an additional coffee break), which should improve their affective well-being without necessarily affecting boundary strength (see Giebel, Wirtz, & Nachreiner, 2008). Therefore, we postulate:

Hypothesis 5: Day-specific boundary strength at work partially mediates the relationship between daily use of flextime and (a) same-evening as well as (b) next-day affect.

Figure 1. Theoretical model of relationships between variables: Flextime use → Work–nonwork boundary strength → PA (positive affect) and NA (negative affect).

Hypothesis 6: Day-specific boundary strength at home partially mediates the relationship between daily use of flextime and (a) same-evening as well as (b) next-day affect.

Study 1

Study 1 is an initial test of our research model with a sample of employees from a German bank which offers an intermediate level of temporal flexibility. Employees may determine their work start and end times and when to take breaks, but there are neither core hours nor an official time registration. Employees are suggested to keep track of their hours themselves and to ensure that they work their contracted hours over the course of a month.

Method

Sample and procedure. We collected data from employees at the headquarter and four branches of a German bank. Participants were offered a study results report and participation in a raffle of 10 restaurant vouchers each worth 50€. In the final sample of 150 employees, 74.7% were female. None of the participants were in supervisory positions. Participant age ranged from 19 to 58 years ($M = 39.5$, $SD = 10.1$) and company tenure from less than 1 year to 42 years ($M = 16.8$, $SD = 10.1$). Average working time per week ranged from 7 to 48 hr ($M = 33.2$, $SD = 10.1$). Participants worked in diverse roles, both in the back and front offices (e.g., cashiers, customer consultants, service advisors, public relations, personnel).

As part of a larger study, participants completed a general questionnaire, followed by two waves of twice-daily surveys over 10 working days. For the current study, we used data from the second diary wave with daily assessments of flextime use (see below). A 2-week data collection phase is considered to “represent a stable and generalizable estimate of social life” (Reis & Wheeler, 1991, p. 287). Of the 303 employees who completed the general questionnaire, 150 filled in the relevant

daily surveys. Due to absence and sickness, the interval between the general questionnaire and the diary phase varied between 10 and 19 weeks ($M = 13.7$, $SD = 1.9$). Participants completed the daily surveys once in the morning during work time and once in the late afternoon or evening during nonwork time. For the work-time survey, we sent e-mail reminders at 10 a.m. For the nonwork time survey, we sent reminders according to individual preferences indicated in the general questionnaire, ranging from 2:30 p.m. to 10 p.m.

We discarded diary entries that were too late (e.g., more than 6 hr after work start, or nonwork entries filled in the next morning). When employees filled in diaries twice because they were interrupted while completing the survey, we discarded the incomplete first survey and kept the second survey. Participants completed 2,223 out of a possible 3,000 daily surveys (14.8 of 20 possible diary entries on average, resulting in a compliance rate of 74.1%); 1,254 entries were daily morning (work) surveys and 969 were daily evening (nonwork) surveys; 80.7% of daily surveys were completed on the computer, 15.4% on smartphones, and 3.9% as paper-and-pencil versions that were mailed to us at the end of each working week.

Measures. The general questionnaire captured demographic variables (gender, childcare responsibilities for children under 14-years-old or children aged 14–18 years, and eldercare). The daily evening survey assessed momentary affect and current-day boundary strength at work, as well as current-day use of flextime. In the daily morning survey, we assessed momentary affect and boundary strength at home on the prior evening. All items were presented in German. Unless indicated otherwise, responses were given on 5-point Likert scales from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Flextime use. Day-specific flextime use was assessed in the evening survey with a single item (“Today, I organized my working hours flexibly”), consistent with Hill et al.’s (2008) suggestion to conceptualize workplace flexibility on a continuum. In diary

studies, abbreviated and single-item measures are accepted research practice (Ohly, Sonnentag, Niessen, & Zapf, 2010). Note, however, that we replicated findings using a multiitem measure, and provide construct validity evidence, in Study 2 below. Flex-time use across days and persons ranged from 1 to 5 ($M = 2.60$, $SD = 1.16$).

Work–nonwork boundary strength. Work–nonwork boundary strength was assessed with two items adapted from Powell and Greenhaus (2010). Same-day boundary strength at work (BSW) was assessed in the evening survey (“I forgot about private matters while I was at work today”) and previous-day boundary strength at home (BSH) was assessed in the morning survey (“I forgot about work while I was at home last night”). While Powell and Greenhaus’s (2010) original items refer to work and family life domains, we used the terms “work” and “private life” to apply to employees independent of family status. Additionally, we replicated findings using multiitem measures in Study 2 below. BSW ranged from 1 to 5 across days and persons ($M = 3.30$, $SD = .84$), as did BSH ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .98$).

Affective well-being. At the start of each diary survey, participants reported their momentary affective well-being on Kessler and Staudinger’s (2009) affect checklist. We selected eight out of the 16 items to assess current positive affect (PA; *delighted, elated, relaxed, serene*) and negative affect (NA; *annoyed, nervous, down, lethargic*). Participants indicated to which extent they felt each affective state “right now” on a visual analogue scale ranging from 0 to 100.² In the general questionnaire, we also assessed trait affect using the full 16-item checklist. We found large correlations between the shortened and full scales at .95 (PA) and .96 (NA; both $ps < .001$). This shows that the shortened instruments validly measure their target constructs. Ratings on the 0–100 visual analogue scale were divided by 10, as the variances were too large for the model to converge. PA ratings ranged from 1.16 to 9.48 ($M = 4.68$, $SD = 1.45$), NA ratings ranged from 0.00 to 6.20 ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 1.59$) across days and persons. The PA scale had satisfactory reliabilities of .90 (Level 1) and .94 (Level 2), and the NA scale had satisfactory reliabilities of .86 (Level 1) and .93 (Level 2).

Data-analytic strategy. As recommended for diary data with day-level data nested within persons, we adopted a random-coefficient multilevel modeling approach (e.g., Hox, 2002), using Mplus 7 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2012). We tested all hypotheses simultaneously with multilevel path analysis, via multilevel structural equation modeling (MSEM), which has two benefits. First, it allows for estimating multiple mediators and multiple outcomes at the same time. Second, it accounts for variability in flextime use, work–nonwork boundary strength, and affect both at the person-level (e.g., some employees use more flextime than others) and at the within-person level (e.g., on some days, employees use more flextime than on others). In Mplus, Level 2 effects (i.e., stable person-level differences) are taken into account while estimating day-level (Level 1) effects. The MSEM approach in Mplus automatically splits the cluster components of the variables between and within and thus replaces the person-mean centering of Level 1 variables. Within-person variability reflects deviations from an employee’s average experiences of flextime use, boundary strength, and affective well-being. This means we

account for average levels of flextime use, boundary strength, and affect when analyzing their relationships on the day-level. MSEM thus produces nonconflated estimates of within- and between-level components of the estimates (Preacher, Zyphur, & Zhang, 2010).

On the day level (Level 1), we entered the measurement point in order to control for time effects (Bolger & Laurenceau, 2013). We also included the affect rating of the prior measurement point (t_{-1} or t_0) to control for its effect on current affective well-being (t_0 or t_{+1}). Specifically, when predicting evening affect, we entered the affect rating from the same-morning work survey; when predicting morning affect, we entered the affect rating from the prior-evening nonwork survey. In the current study, PA and NA represent opposite poles on the valence dimension of the affect circumplex model (Russell, 1980) and correlate at $-.60$ (Level 1) and $-.42$ (Level 2). Given that the residual variances of PA and NA were significant (see Table 2), there seems to be unexplained shared variance in PA and NA which should be intercorrelated. Hence, we let the residual variances of PA and NA correlate (see Figure 1) to achieve acceptable model fit and properly test our hypotheses. The models were estimated using Bayesian analysis, which does not, unlike the maximum likelihood (ML) estimation, make assumptions about the distribution of the indirect effects (Hox, Moerbeek, Kluytmans, & van de Schoot, 2014). It thus provides unbiased estimates for non-normally distributed indirect effects (Preacher et al., 2010). We used Mplus default (i.e., noninformative; $N(0; 10^{10})$ priors for all model parameters.

Results

Preliminary analyses. As a first step, we partitioned the total variance of the study variables into within-person and between-person variances. The intraclass-correlation coefficients (ICC) showed person-level variances ranging from 28.0% to 57.0%, indicating that between 43.0% and 72.0% of the variance was within persons and that within-variance explains a substantial proportion of the overall variance so that multilevel analyses are appropriate. Table 1 provides the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of Study 1 variables. A paired t -test showed that when aggregating across participants’ daily measurements, the boundary at home ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .98$) was significantly stronger than the boundary at work ($M = 3.30$, $SD = .84$) ($t(1,139) = 14.49$; $p < .001$).³

Predicting affect: Main effects. The within-person MSEM model shows several significant relationships between day-specific flextime use, work–nonwork boundary strength, and affective well-being. Hypothesis 1 predicted a negative and Hypothesis 2 predicted a positive relationship between flextime use and boundary strength. The effect of flextime use on BSW was not

² For technical reasons, smartphone users were presented a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *not at all*; 3 = *moderately*; 5 = *extremely*) instead of the visual analogue scale. For analyses, these scores were recoded to align with the visual analogue scale (the Likert points 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were replaced by 0, 25, 50, 75, and 100).

³ However, ratings of boundary strength were different in the general questionnaire where boundary strength at home ($M = 2.87$, $SD = .99$) was rated significantly weaker than boundary strength at work ($M = 3.76$, $SD = .77$), $t(1,127) = 70.13$; $p < .001$.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, ICCs, and Correlations Between Variables at the Person-Level (Above the Diagonal) and at the Day-Level (Below the Diagonal) in Study 1

Variable	M	SD	ICC(1)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Day-level variables													
1. Flextime use	2.60	1.16	48.0	—	-.04	.34**	.14	-.24**	.06	-.17 [†]	-.07	.02	-.05
2. Boundary strength at work	3.30	.84	43.8	-.04	—	.12	.23*	-.20 [†]	.03	-.02	-.03	-.02	.00
3. Boundary strength at home	3.70	.98	45.3	.10*	-.10 [†]	—	.33***	-.49***	-.22*	.10	-.05	-.24 [†]	-.24
4. Positive affect	4.68	1.45	47.4	.08 [†]	.02	.19***	—	-.42***	-.15*	-.09	-.13	-.11	-.16 [†]
5. Negative affect	2.87	1.59	57.0	-.04	-.04	-.09**	-.60***	—	.18*	-.05	.08	.00	.07
6. Working hours	8.23	1.46	28.0	-.22***	-.01	-.17**	-.15***	.15***	—	-.39***	-.55***	-.30**	-.31**
Person-level variables													
7. Gender ^a										—	.15 [†]	.19**	.21***
8. Childcare (0–14 years) ^b											—	.56***	.47***
9. Childcare (14–18 years) ^b												—	.60***
10. Eldercare ^b													—

Note. Level 1 $N = 2,223$; Level 2 $N = 150$. ICC(1) = Percentage of variance at the person-level. When estimating day-level correlations (Level 1), stable between-person differences were controlled for at Level 2.

^a 0 = male, 1 = female. ^b 0 = no, 1 = yes.

[†] $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

significant ($\beta_1 = -.03$, $p > .05$, failing to support Hypotheses 1a and 2a), but the effect on BSH was significantly positive ($\beta_2 = .09$, $p < .05$; supporting Hypothesis 2b). This indicates that employees have stronger boundaries at home (but not at work) on work days on which they use flextime more; thus, the relationship between flextime use and boundary strength at home is positive (rather than negative).

Hypotheses 3a and 4a predicted relationships between boundary strength and affective well-being in the evening. BSW had no significant relationships with affect the same evening (PA: $\beta_3 = .02$, $p > .05$; NA: $\beta_4 = -.08$, $p > .05$), failing to support Hypothesis 3a. Yet, day-specific BSH was significantly related to affect in the evening, supporting Hypothesis 4a. More specifically, employees experienced more PA ($\beta_5 = .35$, $p < .001$) and less NA ($\beta_6 = -.15$, $p < .05$) in the evenings of days with a stronger boundary at home. A similar pattern emerged for the impact of day-specific boundary strength on affect the next morning (Hypotheses 2b and 3b). BSW did not show relationships with next-morning affect (PA: $\beta_7 = -.12$; NA: $\beta_8 = -.01$, both $ps > .05$), failing to support Hypothesis 3b. Yet, BSH was significantly related to affect the next morning, supporting Hypothesis 4b. More specifically, employees experienced both more PA ($\beta_9 = .21$, $p < .01$) and less NA ($\beta_{10} = -.28$, $p < .001$) the next morning after work days with a stronger boundary at home. In sum, only the boundary at home (and not the boundary at work) mattered for affective well-being. In total, the model explained 5.4% and 2.8% of the within-person variance in same-evening and next-morning PA, respectively, and 1.7% and 4.0% of the within-person variance in same-evening and next-morning NA, respectively. It further accounted for 1.1% of the within-person variability in BSH and 1.8% of the within-person variance in BSW.⁴ All parameter estimates and 95% Bayesian Credibility intervals can be found in Table 2. The upper part of Figure 2 gives an overview of the results.⁵

Predicting affect: Mediation effects. After testing for main effects, we assessed if day-specific BSH mediated the relationship of day-specific flextime use with same-evening or next-

morning affective well-being (Hypothesis 6). We did not test for mediation effects of BSW (Hypothesis 5) because of the lack of significant relationships between the predictor and the mediator, and the mediator and the outcome (Baron & Kenny, 1986). The analyses showed significant indirect effects for day-specific flextime use $\rightarrow$ BSH $\rightarrow$ same-evening PA ($\beta_{21} = .030$, 95% CI [.002, .065]), but not $\rightarrow$ same-evening NA ($\beta_{22} = .010$, 95% CI [-.034, .001]), partly supporting Hypothesis 5a. We found no significant indirect effects for day-specific flextime use $\rightarrow$ BSW $\rightarrow$ next-morning PA ($\beta_{25} = -.009$, 95% CI [-.035, .006]) or $\rightarrow$ next-morning NA ($\beta_{26} = -.001$, 95% CI [-.019, -.016]), failing to support Hypothesis 6b. The direct effect day-specific flextime use $\rightarrow$ same-evening PA was not significant ($\beta_{11} = .09$, $p > .05$). Thus, BSH fully mediates the effect of day-specific flextime use on same-evening PA, pro-

⁴ Note that these and all of the following effect sizes reported are conservative estimations because not all significant Level-1 (day-level) predictors necessarily decrease Level-1 (within-person) residual variance (for details see Nezlek, 2012).

⁵ Anonymous reviewers pointed out that gender as well as childcare and eldercare responsibilities, and day-specific number of working hours might impact flextime use, boundary strength, and affective well-being. In a second model (M_2), we included the person-level variables gender as well as care responsibilities for children under 14, children aged 14–18, and eldercare (all person-level dummy variables). In a third model (M_3), we additionally controlled for day-specific working hours. In M_2 , care for children aged 14–18 was negatively related to the boundary strength at home ($\beta = -.72$, $p < .05$) and women reported stronger boundaries at home than men ($\beta = .39$, $p < .05$). The pattern of findings basically remained the same as in our first model (M_1), that is, maintained the same signs and significance levels with the control variables. In M_3 , care for children aged 14–18 and gender was related to boundary strength at home as reported above, and the number of working hours was negatively related to boundary strength at home ($\beta = -.09$, $p < .01$) and positive affect ($\beta = -.11$, $p < .01$), and positively related to negative affect ($\beta = .13$, $p < .001$). The pattern of findings changed somewhat in comparison to our first model (M_1): The positive relationship between flextime use and boundary strength at home was weakened to trend level ($\beta = .07$, $p < .10$), as was the negative relationship between boundary strength at home and same-evening NA ($\beta = -.12$, $p < .10$).

Table 2

Bayesian Unstandardized Coefficients of the MSEM Model for Testing Main and Mediation Effects on Affect (Study 1)

Effect type	Coefficient	SD	95% CI
Within-person effects			
Slopes			
β_1 : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at work t_0	-.027	.029	[-.085, .030]
β_2 : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at home t_{+1}	.090*	.042	[.007, .172]
β_3 : Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+1}	.081	.078	[-.071, .236]
β_4 : Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+1}	-.086	.073	[-.227, .058]
β_5 : Boundary strength at home $t_{+1} \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+1}	.345***	.068	[.207, .473]
β_6 : Boundary strength at home $t_{+1} \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+1}	-.148*	.068	[-.281, -.014]
β_7 : Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+2}	-.118	.093	[-.298, .066]
β_8 : Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+2}	-.013	.083	[-.172, .153]
β_9 : Boundary strength at home $t_{+1} \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+2}	.209**	.079	[.053, .362]
β_{10} : Boundary strength at home $t_{+1} \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+2}	-.281***	.066	[-.409, -.150]
β_{11} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+1}	.086	.056	[-.023, .194]
β_{12} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+1}	-.033	.053	[-.134, .071]
β_{13} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+2}	-.102	.068	[-.232, .034]
β_{14} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+2}	.026	.059	[-.091, .141]
β_{15} : Positive affect $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+1}	-.012	.023	[-.058, .034]
β_{16} : Negative affect $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+1}	.008	.023	[-.038, .054]
β_{17} : Positive affect $t_{+1} \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+2}	-.030	.024	[-.076, .016]
β_{18} : Positive affect $t_{+1} \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+2}	-.014	.022	[-.057, .029]
Indirect effects (mediation paths)			
β_{19} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+1}	a	a	a
β_{20} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+1}	a	a	a
β_{21} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at home $t_{+1} \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+1}	.030*	.016	[.002, .065]
β_{22} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at home $t_{+1} \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+1}	-.012†	.009	[-.034, .001]
β_{23} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+2}	a	a	a
β_{24} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+2}	a	a	a
β_{25} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at home $t_{+1} \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+2}	-.009	.010	[-.035, .006]
β_{26} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at home $t_{+1} \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+2}	-.001	.008	[-.019, .016]
Variances			
Flextime use t_0	1.057***	.062	[.946, 1.186]
Positive affect t_0	2.257***	.085	[2.097, 2.431]
Negative affect t_0	2.039***	.077	[1.894, 2.195]
Residual variances			
Boundary strength at work t_0	.542***	.031	[.485, .607]
Boundary strength at home t_{+1}	.793***	.054	[.697, .909]
Positive affect t_{+1}	2.149***	.074	[2.007, 2.297]
Negative affect t_{+1}	1.917***	.061	[1.802, 2.041]
Positive affect t_{+2}	2.217***	.085	[2.058, 2.391]
Negative affect t_{+2}	1.804***	.070	[1.674, 1.947]
Between-person effects			
Variances			
Flextime use t_0	1.079***	.173	[.800, 1.475]
Positive affect t_0	2.013***	.271	[1.566, 2.621]
Negative affect t_0	2.531***	.333	[1.983, 3.276]
Residual variances			
Boundary strength at work t_0	.497***	.081	[.367, .684]
Boundary strength at home t_{+1}	.560***	.106	[.389, .801]
Positive affect t_{+1}	.007***	.007	[.001, .028]
Negative affect t_{+1}	.007***	.007	[.001, .027]
Positive affect t_{+2}	.008***	.008	[.001, .030]
Negative affect t_{+2}	.007***	.007	[.001, .027]

Note. Level 1 $N = 2,223$; Level 2 $N = 150$. MSEM = multilevel structural equation modeling; SD = Posterior standard deviation; CI = Bayesian credibility interval.

^a Indirect path was not estimated because at least one of the constituting effects was not significant (predictor $\rightarrow$ mediator or mediator $\rightarrow$ outcome).

† $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

viding partial support for Hypothesis 6a (which predicted partial mediation), but no support for Hypotheses 5a, 5b, and 6b.

Supplemental analyses. Given possible differences between day-level and person-level relationships (Demerouti, Bakker, & Halbesleben, 2015; Enders & Tofghi, 2007), we analyzed if

chronic flextime use, work–nonwork boundary strength, and affect related to one another the same ways as their day-specific counterparts. Consistent with the day-level findings, average flextime use was related to a stronger average boundary at home ($\beta = .27$, $p < .001$), but not at work ($\beta = -.02$, $p > .05$). Different from the

Figure 2. Final MSEM model (upper part: Study 1; lower part: Study 2) with Bayesian unstandardized coefficient estimates: Flextime use $\rightarrow$ Work–nonwork boundary strength $\rightarrow$ PA (positive affect) and NA (negative affect). Both Level 1 and Level 2 relationships were estimated simultaneously; however, for clarity of presentation, only the Level 1 model is shown. Dotted lines represent nonsignificant relationships. Prior affect ratings were controlled for in the analyses, but they are not shown for clarity of presentation. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

day level, neither chronic BSH nor BSW were related to affect (all $ps > .05$). In sum, the relationships partly differ between the two hierarchical levels; affective benefits of a strong BSH were only apparent at the day-level.

Discussion

Study 1 examined relationships between day-specific flextime use, work–nonwork boundary strength, and affective well-being using experience-sampling methodology. In this initial test of our research model, day-specific flextime use was related to a stronger boundary at home the same evening, which in turn was associated with better same-evening and next-morning affective well-being (more PA and less NA). Boundary strength at home mediated the relation between

day-specific flextime use and same-evening PA. In contrast, day-specific flextime use was unrelated to boundary strength at work, which in turn was unrelated to same-evening or next-morning affect. Thus, we partially confirmed our model suggesting that day-specific flextime use impacts affective well-being by strengthening the daily boundary at home, but not by impacting the daily boundary at work. Affective benefits were evident both in the same evening and the next morning. Effect sizes at the day level were relatively small, which is, however, not unusual for day-level relationships (see, e.g., Hülshager et al., 2014).

Our results support the proposition that flextime use undergoes daily fluctuations, probably stemming from accommodating day-specific work and nonwork demands. Findings highlight the importance of distinguishing levels of analysis when investigating the

work–nonwork interface. Supplemental analyses showed that the day-level relationships were not fully identical with the person-level. The MSEM approach automatically disentangles within-person and between-person variances so that results reflect pure within-person and between-person relationships. Specifically, at the person-level, only flextime use and boundary strength at home were positively related to each other. Flextime use was unrelated to boundary strength at work and work–nonwork boundary strength was unrelated to employees' affective well-being.

Another interesting difference between the two levels concerned the ratings of work–nonwork boundary strength. In the general questionnaire, employees rated their boundary at home to be significantly weaker than their boundary at work (see Footnote 3), which is in line with previous person-level studies yielding similar results (Hecht & Allen, 2009; Janke et al., 2014). However, the aggregated day-level scores of work–nonwork boundary strength show a different picture: Across diary entries, participants rated the boundary at home as significantly stronger than the boundary at work. This points at a possible bias when judging average work–nonwork boundaries: Employees may weigh work-to-nonwork intrusions more heavily or remember them more easily than nonwork-to-work intrusions.

The strengths of Study 1 are the twice-daily assessments and the 2-week diary phase. However, though single-item measures are widely used in diary research (Ohly et al., 2010), the validity of the measures of flextime use and work–nonwork boundary strength should be assessed in more detail. Moreover, because our participants work in one organization and under the same flextime policy, it is important to replicate results in employees with more diversity in flextime availability. Finally, although we found positive associations of day-specific flextime use with boundary strength at home, the underlying mechanisms are not fully understood. We address these issues in Study 2.

Study 2

Study 2 aimed at replicating the relationships from Study 1 in a more heterogeneous sample of employees who work in different organizations with different flextime arrangements. We applied improved measures of flextime use and boundary strength and provide evidence for construct validity of the measures used in Study 1. Finally, given the positive relationship of flextime use with boundary strength, we investigated goal completion as a mechanism underlying this association.

As described in the introduction, day-specific flextime use may strengthen boundaries by allowing employees to complete goals from one life domain before transitioning back to the other domain. As completed goals are deactivated in memory (Marsh et al., 1998), employees do not engage in work-related thoughts or actions when at home, and do not engage in nonwork-related thoughts and actions when at work. Day-specific goal completion may therefore reduce the number of interdomain transitions and act as mediator in the positive relationship between day-specific flextime use and boundary strength. We tested this assumption in Study 2. We again expected partial mediation given that there may be competing mechanisms. For example, using flextime may lead others to refrain from placing additional demands on employees. When leaving early for a medical appointment, coworkers may refrain from contacting the employee during nonwork time; when

working longer to meet an urgent deadline, the spouse may refrain from asking the employee to call the children's teacher during work time. This would lead to stronger boundaries by reducing competing demands rather completing currently activated goals. On that background, we propose:

Hypothesis 7: Day-specific goal completion partially mediates the positive relationship between day-specific flextime use and work–nonwork boundary strength.

Method

Sample and procedure. We collected data from office workers from various German organizations. Participants were contacted through a professional survey company and were offered incremental incentives from 2.00€ to 44.50€, depending on the number of diary entries completed. We obtained usable questionnaires from 608 employees, of which 63% were female. None of the participants were in supervisory positions. The age range was 19 to 67 years ($M = 44.3$, $SD = 11.2$) and company tenure ranged from less than 1 to 44 years ($M = 10.9$, $SD = 10.2$). Average weekly working times ranged from 6 to 67 hr ($M = 32.5$, $SD = 13.1$).

As part of a larger study, participants completed a general questionnaire, followed by daily surveys across eight consecutive working days. To ensure we exclusively captured the boundary strength at home on work days, we did not collect data on Mondays as in that case, participants would have indicated boundary strength on weekends when rating the prior day's boundary strength at home. Participants completed the daily survey in the late afternoon or evening during nonwork time. For the daily survey, we sent e-mail reminders at 3 p.m.; participants were able to fill in the diary until 3 a.m. the next day. Participants completed 3,164 out of a possible 4,840 daily surveys (on average 5.2 of eight possible diary entries, resulting in a compliance rate of 65.4%). Participants' working time arrangements differed in flexibility; 44.1% had low flexibility (e.g., every day from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m.), 36% had intermediate flexibility (i.e., could choose start, end, and break times within core hours on a daily basis; mostly with time registration), 3.6% had high flexibility (i.e., could choose start, end, and break times on a daily basis; usually without time registration). The remaining 10% had other working time arrangements.

Measures. In the general questionnaire, we assessed the same demographic variables as in Study 1. In the daily survey, we assessed momentary affect, boundary strength at work, and flextime use on the current working day. Further, we assessed prior-day boundary strength at home. To establish the construct validity of the boundary strength measure, we assessed life domain interference and enhancement, psychological detachment, work–family integration-blurring, and boundary management strategy use on the current working day. Additionally, participants reported current-day working hours and work breaks. Extending Study 1, we assessed work and nonwork goal completion as possible mechanism underlying the relationship between day-specific flextime use and work–nonwork boundary strength. All items were presented in German. Unless indicated otherwise, responses were given on 5-point Likert scales from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Flextime use. The seven-item measure consisted of the single-item measure of flextime used in Study 1 and six additional items adapted from Clark (2002). The items covered

flexibility regarding start and end times and work breaks (e.g., “Today, I arrived at work when it fit me best”). Work breaks were defined as times during which employees interrupted their work (e.g., for making private calls, eating or drinking, private Internet use). Across days and persons, flextime use ranged from 1 to 5 ($M = 2.36$, $SD = 1.14$). Correlations of the seven-item measure of flextime use with the single item used in Study 1 were .68 (Level 1) and .89 (Level 2).⁶

Work–nonwork boundary strength. Work–nonwork boundary strength was assessed with six items adapted from Powell and Greenhaus (2010). Three items assessed boundary strength at work (BSW; e.g., “I forgot about private matters while I was at work today”) and at home (BSH; e.g., “I left work behind when I went home last night”), respectively. BSW ranged from 1 to 5 across days and persons ($M = 3.17$, $SD = .98$), as did BSH ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .99$). A confirmatory factor analysis showed that the fit of the two-factor model distinguishing boundary strength by life domain ($\chi^2 = 21.325$; $df = 17$; CFI = .999; RMSEA = .009; $\omega = .923$) outmatched the fit of a single-factor model ($\chi^2 = 2906.028$; $df = 19$; CFI = .438; RMSEA = .219; $\omega = .624$; Satorra-Bentler scaled $\chi^2 = 3322.18$; $df = 2$; $p < .001$).⁷

Affective well-being. Participants reported their momentary affective well-being with the same items and instruction as in Study 1. Unlike in Study 1, they rated current affect on an 11-point Likert scale from 0 (*not at all*) to 10 (*very much*). PA ratings ranged from 0 to 10 across days and persons ($M = 5.87$, $SD = 1.97$), as did ratings for NA ($M = 2.59$, $SD = 1.98$).

Goal completion. Goal completion was measured with eight items adapted from Syrek and Antoni (2014). Four items assessed work goal completion (e.g., “Today, I could complete all work tasks I set up this morning”) and nonwork goal completion (e.g., “Today, I didn’t manage to complete all important private tasks”), respectively. Both work goal completion ($M = 3.76$, $SD = .79$) and nonwork goal completion ($M = 3.41$, $SD = .78$) ranged from 1 to 5 across days and persons.

Data-analytic strategy. We used MSEM in Mplus 7 and Bayesian analysis. As in Study 1, we used Mplus default (i.e., noninformative; $N(0; 10^{10})$) priors for all model parameters. For the replications, we controlled for time effects and the affect ratings of the prior measurement point. Analyzing goal completion as an underlying mechanism, we additionally accounted for the work and nonwork goal completion ratings of the prior day.

Results

Preliminary analyses. We partitioned the total variance of the study variables into the variances within and between persons. As per the intraclass-correlation coefficients (ICC), person-level variances ranged from 48.0% to 78.9%, indicating that between 21.2% and 52.0% of the variance was within persons and suggesting that within-variance explains a substantial proportion of the overall variance so that multilevel analyses are appropriate. Table 3 provides the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the focal Study 2, and the internal scale consistencies (α), which were all satisfactory. A paired *t*-test of the strength of the two boundaries showed, like in Study 1, that the mean aggregated daily BSH ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .98$) was significantly stronger than BSW ($M = 3.17$, $SD = .96$), $t(1,591) = 141.63$; $p < .001$.⁸

Replicating findings of Study 1: Main effects. As for Hypotheses 1 and 2, both the effects of flextime use on BSW ($\beta_1 = .15$, $p < .001$) and on BSH were positive and significant ($\beta_2 = .07$, $p < .05$), indicating that employees reported stronger boundaries at work and at home on work days with more flextime use, supporting Hypotheses 2a and 2b.

Supporting Hypotheses 3a and 4a, employees experienced more PA ($\beta_3 = .14$, $p < .001$) and less NA ($\beta_4 = -.12$, $p < .01$) in the evenings of days with stronger boundaries at work. The same goes for boundaries at home: Employees experienced more PA ($\beta_5 = .08$, $p < .05$) and less NA ($\beta_6 = -.12$, $p < .01$) in the evenings of days with stronger boundaries at home. A different pattern emerged for the impact of day-specific boundary strength on affective well-being the next evening (Hypotheses 3b and 4b). Boundary strength at work was unrelated to next-evening affective well-being (PA: $\beta_7 = .04$; NA:

⁶ Table 5 provides information regarding the construct validity of the 1-item measure of flextime use from Study 1. We investigated whether the perception of “having organized one’s working hours flexibly” on a specific day was linked to objective changes in working hours and breaks. Bivariate correlations at Level 1 (while accounting for stable between-person differences at Level 2) showed that day-specific flextime use was related to day-specific deviations from average start and end times, working times, and breaks. On days when employees worked more flexibly, they started work later (Study 1 $p < .01$), finished earlier (Study 1 $p < .001$), worked fewer hours (Study 1 $p < .001$; Study 2 $p < .01$), took longer breaks (Study 2 $p < .01$), and took more breaks (Study 2 $p < .05$). Overall, flexibility was used to shorten the time spent working, rather than working longer.

⁷ Table 5 provides information regarding the construct validity of the work–nonwork boundary measures. It gives an overview of the nomological network around the measures of work–nonwork boundary strength (at work and at home), showing pure within-person (Level 1) and between-person (Level 2) correlations. Participants reported *life domain interference and enhancement* using 12 items from the Interference and Enhancement Scale (Fisher, Bulger, & Smith, 2009) that has four subscales (personal life interference with work, personal life enhancement of work, work interference with personal life, and work enhancement of personal life). *Psychological detachment from work* was captured with the four-item psychological detachment scale from the Recovery Experience Questionnaire (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). Day-specific work–family integration-blurring was measured with the three-item Work-Family Integration-Blurring Scale (Desrochers et al., 2005). Day-specific use of active *boundary management strategy* use was reported on Kossek, Lautsch, and Eaton’s (2006) three-item measure. Except work–family integration-blurring at the day-level, all reliabilities were satisfactory (see Table 5). Finally, participants indicated their start and end times, and the duration and number of breaks on the specific day. The constructs are systematically related to other measures of the work–nonwork interface both at the within-person level and at the between-person level. Given the high correlations between work–nonwork boundary strength and interference of life domains, we ran two MCFAs to show that the constructs are empirically distinct. The four-factor model (BSW; BSH; home interference with work; work interference with home; $\chi^2 = 289.618$; $df = 98$; CFI = .984; RMSEA = .025) was a better fit than both the two-factor model (work–nonwork boundary strength; life domain interference; $\chi^2 = 7654.896$; $df = 106$; CFI = .372; RMSEA = .150; Satorra-Bentler scaled $\chi^2 = 146.614$; $df = 2$; $p < .001$) and the one-factor solution with boundary strength and interference loading on the same factor ($\chi^2 = 7819.026$; $df = 108$; CFI = .359; RMSEA = .150; Satorra-Bentler scaled $\chi^2 = 3388.029$; $df = 10$; $p < .001$). This supports the uniqueness of our boundary strength measures relative to measures of work–family interference and other related measures and is consistent with Hecht and Allen’s (2009) findings.

⁸ In contrast to Study 1, ratings of boundary strength were the same in the general questionnaire where the boundary strength at home ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 1.06$) was significantly higher than the boundary at work ($M = 3.18$, $SD = .91$), $t(1,607) = 11.51$; $p < .05$.

Table 3
Means, Standard Deviations, ICCs, Reliabilities, and Correlations Between Variables at the Person-Level (Above Diagonals) and at the Day-Level (Below Diagonal) in Study 2

Variable	M	SD	ICC (1)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Day-level variables															
1. Flextime use	2.36	1.14	78.9	(.86/.98)	.13*	.10*	.07	.04	-.05	-.27***	.15**	-.19***	-.03	-.02	-.06
2. Boundary strength at work	3.17	.96	55.8	.11***	(.83/.99)	.40***	.22***	-.27***	.25***	.24***	-.05	-.06	-.09*	-.05	-.02
3. Boundary strength at home	3.70	.98	51.0	.06*	.12***	(.83/.98)	.43***	-.41***	.40***	.36***	-.15**	-.08†	-.01	-.07	-.05
4. Positive affect	5.87	1.97	56.8	.11***	.09**	.12***	(.91/.95)	-.64***	.36***	.30***	-.07	-.17***	.03	-.05†	-.03
5. Negative affect	2.60	1.98	58.5	-.06*	-.07*	-.08**	-.53***	(.84/.94)	-.46***	-.45***	.09†	.09*	.04	.06	.02
6. Nonwork goal completion	3.41	.78	48.0	.05†	.07**	.05*	.21***	-.21***	(.70/.89)	.67***	-.22***	-.02	-.06	-.06	.01
7. Work goal completion	3.76	.79	51.9	-.01	.10**	.06*	.15***	-.15***	.27***	(.74/.90)	-.22***	.05	-.09*	-.03	-.03
8. Working hours	7.84	1.90	61.3	-.07	.00	-.05*	-.08**	.09***	-.10***	-.05†	—	-.27***	-.03	-.02	.04
Person-level variables															
9. Gender ^{a†}													.07†	.11*	.04
10. Childcare (0–14 years) ^b													—	—	.04
11. Childcare (14–18 years) ^b														—	.04
12. Eldercare ^b															—

Note. Level 1 $N = 3,164$; Level 2 $N = 608$. ICC(1) = Percentage of variance at the person-level. Reliability estimates (α), where available, are shown in parentheses along the diagonal; the first value refers to the day-level (Level 1), the second refers to the person-level (Level 2). When estimating day-level correlations (Level 1), stable between-person differences were controlled for at Level 2.

^a 0 = male, 1 = female. ^b 0 = no, 1 = yes.

† $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

$\beta_8 = -.03$, both $ps > .05$), failing to support Hypothesis 3b. Yet, boundary strength at home was significantly related to better affective well-being the next evening. More specifically, employees experienced both more PA ($\beta_9 = .44$, $p < .001$) and less NA ($\beta_{10} = -.38$, $p < .001$) the next evening after work days with stronger boundaries at home, supporting Hypothesis 4b. Results thus indicate that the affective benefits of strong boundaries at home last until the next evening, whereas the benefits of strong boundaries at work disappear the next day. In total, the model explained 2.3% and 4.6% of the within-person variance in same-evening and next-morning PA, respectively, and 3.4% and 3.5% of the within-person variance in same-evening and next-morning NA, respectively. It further accounted for 0.3% of the within-person variability in BSH and 1.3% of the within-person variance in BSW (see Footnote 4). All parameter estimates and their 95% Bayesian credibility intervals can be found in Table 4. The lower part of Figure 2 gives an overview of the results.

Replicating findings of Study 1: Mediation effects. After testing the main effects, we assessed if day-specific boundary strength mediated the relationship of day-specific flextime use with same-evening or next-evening affect. We found significant indirect effects for day-specific flextime use $\rightarrow$ BSW $\rightarrow$ same-evening PA ($\beta_{19} = .021$, 95% CI [.001, .037]) and $\rightarrow$ same-evening NA ($\beta_{20} = -.018$, 95% CI [-.033, -.007]). The direct effect day-specific flextime use $\rightarrow$ same-evening PA ($\beta_{11} = .24$, $p < .001$) and day-specific flextime use $\rightarrow$ same-evening NA ($\beta_{12} = -.14$, $p < .01$) were also significant. BSW thus mediates the relationship only partially, supporting Hypothesis 4a. Given the lack of significant relationships between mediator and outcome, we did not test for mediation effects of BSW for predicting next-evening affect (Hypothesis 4b). No significant indirect effect emerged for day-specific flextime use $\rightarrow$ BSH $\rightarrow$ same-evening PA ($\beta_{21} = .005$, 95% CI [.000, .014]), but for day-specific flextime use $\rightarrow$ BSH $\rightarrow$ same-evening NA ($\beta_{22} = -.008$, 95% CI [-.019, -.001]), indicating that BSH partially mediates the relationship between day-specific flextime use and same-evening NA. Finally, significant indirect effects emerged for day-specific flextime use $\rightarrow$ BSH $\rightarrow$ next-evening PA ($\beta_{24} = .030$, 95% CI [.004, .059]) and $\rightarrow$ next-evening NA ($\beta_{25} = -.026$, 95% CI [-.051, -.003]). The direct effects day-specific flextime use $\rightarrow$ next-evening PA ($\beta_{13} = .03$, $p > .05$) and day-specific flextime use $\rightarrow$ next-evening NA ($\beta_{14} = .01$, $p > .05$) were not significant. Thus, BSH fully mediates the relationship, partially supporting Hypothesis 6a and fully supporting Hypothesis 6b. In sum, Hypotheses 5a, 6a, and 6b, but not Hypothesis 5b were supported. All parameter estimates and 95% Bayesian credibility intervals can be found in Table 4.⁹

Supplemental analyses I. As in Study 1, we tested if the day-level relationships could also be found at the person-level.

⁹ As in Study 1, in a second step, we reran the model controlling for gender as well as childcare and eldercare responsibilities, and day-specific number of working hours. Given the larger sample size in Study 2, we included all control variables at once. Accordingly, in a second model (M_2), we included gender as well as care responsibilities for children under 14, children aged 14–18, and eldercare (all person-level dummy variables) and working hours (day-level variable) into our analyses. Women reported to use flextime less than men ($\beta = -.38$, $p < .001$). The number of working hours was related to less PA ($\beta = -.07$, $p < .001$) and more NA ($\beta = .08$, $p < .001$). The pattern of findings basically remained the same as in our first model (M_1), that is, maintained the same signs and significance levels with the control variables included.

Table 4

Bayesian Unstandardized Coefficients of the MSEM Model for Testing Main and Mediation Effects on Affect (Study 2)

Effect type	Coefficient	SD	95% CI
Within-person effects			
Slopes			
β_1 : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at work t_0	.152***	.028	[.097, .207]
β_2 : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at home t_0	.069*	.031	[.008, .129]
β_3 : Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_0	.144***	.037	[.072, .217]
β_4 : Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_0	-.122**	.037	[-.193, -.050]
β_5 : Boundary strength at home $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_0	.077*	.039	[+.000, .154]
β_6 : Boundary strength at home $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_0	-.123**	.038	[-.196, -.048]
β_7 : Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+1}	.039	.043	[-.045, .124]
β_8 : Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+1}	-.026	.043	[-.110, .060]
β_9 : Boundary strength at home $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+1}	.443***	.044	[.357, .529]
β_{10} : Boundary strength at home $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+1}	-.382***	.043	[-.468, -.296]
β_{11} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_0	.240***	.051	[.140, .340]
β_{12} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_0	-.136**	.050	[-.234, -.038]
β_{13} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+1}	.033	.060	[-.077, -.004]
β_{14} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+1}	.006	.059	[-.110, .121]
β_{15} : Positive affect $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+1}	-.040*	.019	[-.077, -.004]
β_{16} : Negative affect $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+1}	-.057**	.019	[-.094, -.020]
β_{17} : Positive affect $t_{-1} \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_0	-.009	.019	[-.046, .027]
β_{18} : Negative affect $t_{-1} \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_0	-.066**	.019	[-.103, -.029]
Indirect effects (mediation paths)			
β_{19} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_0	.021***	.007	[.010, .037]
β_{20} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_0	-.018**	.007	[-.033, -.007]
β_{21} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at home $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_0	.005†	.004	[.000, .014]
β_{22} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at home $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_0	-.008*	.005	[-.019, -.001]
β_{23} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+1}	a	a	a
β_{24} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+1}	a	a	a
β_{25} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at home $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_{+1}	.030*	.014	[.004, .059]
β_{26} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at home $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_{+1}	-.026*	.012	[-.051, -.003]
Variances			
Flextime use t_0	.324***	.009	[.306, .344]
Positive affect t_{-1}	2.075***	.061	[1.962, 2.198]
Negative affect t_{-1}	2.061***	.060	[1.947, 2.183]
Residual variances			
Boundary strength at work t_0	.597***	.017	[.565, .633]
Boundary strength at home t_0	.608***	.019	[.572, .646]
Positive affect t_0	2.105***	.055	[2.000, 2.217]
Negative affect t_0	2.031***	.053	[1.930, 2.137]
Positive affect t_{+1}	2.681***	.072	[2.543, 2.826]
Negative affect t_{+1}	2.637***	.071	[2.503, 2.782]
Between-person effects			
Variances			
Flextime use t_0	1.220***	.076	[1.081, 1.380]
Positive affect t_{-1}	3.390***	.228	[2.977, 3.872]
Negative affect t_{-1}	3.623***	.237	[3.189, 4.122]
Residual variances			
Boundary strength at work t_0	.748***	.053	[.651, .860]
Boundary strength at home t_{+1}	.626***	.049	[.539, .730]
Positive affect t_0	.004***	.004	[.000, .015]
Negative affect t_0	.004***	.004	[.001, .015]
Positive affect t_{+1}	.005***	.006	[.000, .021]
Negative affect t_{+1}	.005***	.006	[.000, .022]

Note. Level 1 $N = 3,164$; Level 2 $N = 608$. MSEM = multilevel structural equation modeling; SD = Posterior standard deviation; CI = Bayesian credibility interval.

^a Indirect path was not estimated because the mediator $\rightarrow$ outcome effect was not significant.

† $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Average flextime use was related to stronger boundaries, both at work ($\beta = .10, p < .01$) and at home ($\beta = .10, p < .01$). However, only the BSH (and not the BSW) was associated with more PA ($\beta = .15, p < .01$) and less NA ($\beta = -.12, p < .05$) in the evenings and the affective benefits of a strong BSH

disappeared the next day. In sum, the relationships are only partly identical at the two hierarchical levels.

Zooming in: Goal completion as an underlying mechanism. Regarding Hypothesis 7, day-specific flextime use was positively related to nonwork goal completion ($\beta_1 = .07, p < .05$),

Table 5

Reliabilities and Correlations Between Variables at the Person-Level (Above Diagonals) and at the Day-Level (Below Diagonal) in Study 2

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Boundary strength at home	(.83/.99)	.40***	-.38***	.18***	-.30***	.26***	.99***	-.52***	.28***
2. Boundary strength at work	.13***	(.83/.99)	-.27***	.09†	-.41***	.23***	.38***	-.35***	.45***
3. Work interference with personal life	-.07*	-.03	(.84/.99)	.00	.73***	-.01	-.39***	.56***	.13*
4. Work enhancement of personal life	.09**	.09**	.00	(.73/.97)	.23***	.64***	.18***	.23***	.09†
5. Personal life interference with work	-.06*	-.16***	.43***	.11**	(.69/.96)	-.09†	-.29***	.66***	.04
6. Personal life enhancement of work	.11***	.11***	.05	.47***	.01	(.79/.96)	.25***	-.03	.23***
7. Psychological detachment from work	.82***	.15***	-.11***	.10***	-.07**	.11***	(.89/.99)	-.52***	.26***
8. Work–family integration-blurring	-.13***	-.12***	.17***	-.01	.20***	-.07**	-.13***	(.16/.76)	-.24***
9. Boundary management strategy use	.06*	.17***	.12***	.15***	.05†	.20***	.08**	-.19***	(.70/.89)

Note. Level 1 $N = 3,164$; Level 2 $N = 608$. Reliability estimates (α) are shown in parentheses along the diagonal; the first value refers to the day-level (Level 1), the second refers to the person-level (Level 2). When estimating correlations between variables at the day-level, stable between-person differences were controlled for at Level 2.

† $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

but unrelated to work goal completion ($\beta_2 = -.01$, $p > .05$). Nonwork goal completion was in turn associated with stronger boundaries at work during the day ($\beta_3 = .07$, $p < .01$) and work goal completion was associated with stronger boundaries at home the same evening ($\beta_4 = .07$, $p < .05$). Thus, on days when employees used more flexibility, they indicated to have completed more nonwork (but not work) goals. Moreover, both work and nonwork goal completion were associated with better affective well-being the same evening (work goal completion: PA: $\beta_{11} = .22$, $p < .001$; NA: $\beta_{12} = -.22$, $p < .001$; nonwork goal completion: PA: $\beta_{13} = .35$, $p < .001$; NA: $\beta_{14} = -.35$, $p < .001$). This indicates that persons report more positive and less negative affect on evenings when they completed more goals either in work or in nonwork life.

To investigate if goal completion mediated the relationship of day-specific flextime use with boundary strength, we estimated the indirect effect of day-specific flextime use $\rightarrow$ nonwork goal completion $\rightarrow$ BSW, which was significant ($\beta_{23} = .004$, 95% CI [.001, .009]). The direct effect of flextime use $\rightarrow$ BSW was also significant ($\beta_6 = .15$, $p < .001$), nonwork goal completion thus mediates the relationship only partially. The indirect effect via work goal completion was not estimated because the relationship flextime use $\rightarrow$ work goal completion was not significant. In total, the model explained 6.1% and 6.8% of the within-person variance in same-evening PA and NA, respectively. It further accounted for 0.7% of the within-person variability in BSH and 1.7% of the within-person variability in BSW, and for 2.8% of the within-person variability in work goal completion and for 2.6% of the within-person variability in nonwork goal completion (see Footnote 4). All parameter estimates and their 95% confidence intervals can be found in Table 6 (see Footnote 9). Figure 3 gives an overview of the results.

Supplemental analyses II. We again analyzed whether the day-level relationships also held at the person-level. Average flextime use was not related to average nonwork goal completion ($\beta = .01$, $p > .05$), and was even negatively related to average work goal completion ($\beta = -.07$, $p < .001$). Average nonwork goal completion was positively related to BSW ($\beta = .31$, $p < .001$) and average work goal completion was positively related to BSH ($\beta = .46$, $p < .001$). This indicates that chronic

experiences of goal completion in one life domain may strengthen the boundaries of the other life domain, and that flextime use is no longer beneficial (or even harmful) for goal completion when used chronically.

Discussion

Study 2 aimed to replicate the findings of Study 1 with an independent sample with diverse flextime arrangements and using improved measures of flextime use and boundary strength. We confirmed most of the findings of Study 1. Importantly, we found even more of the hypothesized effects to be significant. Specifically, day-specific flextime use was associated with stronger boundaries both at work and at home, and these in turn were associated with better affective well-being the same evening. However, only the affective benefits of strong boundaries at home lasted until the next day. As in Study 1, effect sizes at the day-level were relatively small, which replicates prior studies (e.g., Hülshager et al., 2014).

One explanation why some relationships were significant in Study 2 but not Study 1 could be that all Study 1 participants worked in the same bank under the same general flextime policy. Study 2 participants, in comparison, were from various organizations and had different levels of flextime availability. Moreover, Study 2 participants worked in more diverse jobs with probably more heterogeneous job demands. The complexity and duration of job demands might influence the effects of flextime use, which is especially important in occupations where goals concern longer-term projects. One could assume that temporal flexibility use is especially important in occupations where work tasks or goals concern longer projects across several days or weeks. Although not tested, the homogenous sample in Study 1 might mask certain completion effects compared with Study 2 where employees worked in diverse jobs with probably more heterogeneous job demands. Another difference between the two studies concerns the data collection strategy: While Study 1 used twice-daily measurements, data were collected once daily in Study 2. Still, we found very similar effects in both samples, with results being even more robust in Study 2. Given the convergent findings with once and

Table 6

Bayesian Unstandardized Coefficients of the MSEM Model for Testing Main and Mediation Effects on Affect (Via Goal Completion; Study 2)

Effect type	Coefficient	SD	95% CI
Within-person effects			
Slopes			
β_1 : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Nonwork goal completion t_0	.065*	.025	[.016, .114]
β_2 : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Work goal completion t_0	-.006	.023	[-.052, .040]
β_3 : Nonwork goal completion $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at work t_0	.067**	.022	[.024, .110]
β_4 : Work goal completion $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at home t_0	.067*	.026	[.016, .117]
β_5 : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at home t_0	.067*	.031	[.005, .128]
β_6 : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at work t_0	.147***	.028	[.092, .202]
β_7 : Boundary strength at home $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_0	.052	.039	[-.024, .129]
β_8 : Boundary strength at home $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_0	.092*	.038	[-.166, -.019]
β_9 : Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_0	.108*	.037	[.034, .180]
β_{10} : Boundary strength at work $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_0	-.082*	.037	[-.155, -.010]
β_{11} : Work goal completion $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_0	.222***	.045	[.134, .309]
β_{12} : Work goal completion $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_0	-.222***	.043	[-.308, -.139]
β_{13} : Nonwork goal completion $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_0	.348***	.040	[.271, .427]
β_{14} : Nonwork goal completion $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_0	-.350***	.039	[-.426, -.273]
β_{15} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_0	.231***	.051	[.130, .331]
β_{16} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_0	-.130*	.050	[-.227, -.030]
β_{17} : Nonwork goal completion $t_{-1} \rightarrow$ Nonwork goal completion t_0	-.120**	.041	[-.194, -.034]
β_{18} : Work goal completion $t_{-1} \rightarrow$ Work goal completion t_0	.142**	.040	[.060, .214]
β_{19} : Work goal completion $t_{-1} \rightarrow$ Nonwork goal completion t_0	.108*	.040	[.027, .182]
β_{20} : Nonwork goal completion $t_{-1} \rightarrow$ Work goal completion t_0	-.123**	.039	[-.193, -.041]
β_{21} : Positive affect $t_{-1} \rightarrow$ Positive affect t_0	.021	.019	[-.016, .058]
β_{22} : Negative affect $t_{-1} \rightarrow$ Negative affect t_0	-.035†	.019	[-.072, .003]
Indirect effects (mediation paths)			
β_{23} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Nonwork goal completion $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at work t_0	.004*	.002	[.001, .009]
β_{24} : Flextime use $t_0 \rightarrow$ Work goal completion $t_0 \rightarrow$ Boundary strength at home t_0	a	a	a
Variances			
Nonwork goal completion t_{-1}	.417***	.019	[.382, .455]
Work goal completion t_{-1}	.418***	.019	[.383, .459]
Positive affect t_{-1}	2.089***	.062	[1.973, 2.213]
Negative affect t_{-1}	2.069***	.061	[1.957, 2.192]
Residual variances			
Flextime use t_0	.324***	.009	[.306, .343]
Boundary strength at work t_0	.595***	.017	[.562, .630]
Boundary strength at home t_0	.608***	.019	[.572, .646]
Positive affect t_0	2.062***	.055	[1.957, 2.173]
Negative affect t_0	1.988***	.053	[1.888, 2.095]
Nonwork goal completion t_0	.481***	.014	[.454, .509]
Work goal completion t_0	.429***	.013	[.404, .455]
Between-person effects			
Variances			
Flextime use t_0	1.223***	.076	[1.085, 1.383]
Positive affect t_{-1}	3.413***	.232	[2.996, 3.905]
Negative affect t_{-1}	3.627***	.240	[3.191, 4.133]
Nonwork goal completion t_{-1}	.607***	.048	[.521, .708]
Work goal completion t_{-1}	.557***	.045	[.478, .652]
Residual variances			
Boundary strength at work t_0	.700***	.050	[.610, .805]
Boundary strength at home t_0	.528***	.043	[.451, .620]
Positive affect t_0	.005***	.004	[.001, .017]
Negative affect t_0	.004***	.004	[.001, .018]
Nonwork goal completion t_0	.001***	.002	[.000, .006]
Work goal completion t_0	.001***	.002	[.000, .006]

Note. Level 1 $N = 3,164$; Level 2 $N = 608$. MSEM = multilevel structural equation modeling; SD = Posterior standard deviation; CI = Bayesian credibility interval.

^a Indirect path was not estimated because the predictor $\rightarrow$ mediator effect was not significant.

† $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

twice-daily measurements, we conclude that once-daily measurements of our focal study variables are sufficient and have the advantage that they reduce participant burden and increase compliance.

Study 2 also provided evidence for construct validity of two focal measures, flextime use and work–nonwork boundary strength, which strengthens confidence in the findings of Study 1 that employed one-item measures. We infer that participants

Figure 3. Final extended MSEM model (Study 2) with Bayesian unstandardized coefficient estimates: Flextime use $\rightarrow$ Goal completion $\rightarrow$ Work–nonwork boundary strength $\rightarrow$ PA (positive affect) and NA (negative affect). Both Level 1 and Level 2 relationships were estimated simultaneously; however, for clarity of presentation, only the Level 1 model is shown. Dotted lines represent nonsignificant relationships. Prior affect and goal completion ratings were controlled for in the analyses, but they are not shown for clarity of presentation.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

interpreted the single flextime use item in the intended way, namely as adapting working times according to their needs, aka deviating from their usual start, end, and break times. Moreover, the results demonstrate the usefulness of distinguishing boundaries by life domain and that it would be unjustified to equate boundary strength with related constructs such as work–home interference or enhancement (Hecht & Allen, 2009). One exception is psychological detachment from work which was very high correlated with boundary strength at home, suggesting that these concepts are practically identical.

Study 2 furthermore supports the proposition that nonwork goal completion is one of the mechanisms underlying the positive relationship between daily flextime use and boundary strength at work. Thus, employees might have stronger boundaries at work on days when they use flextime more because they manage to complete nonwork goals before transitioning to the work domain. Interestingly, daily flextime use did not help complete work goals before transitioning to the nonwork domain. Still, the results point to the importance of distinguishing the person- and day-levels of analysis, given that average flextime use was unrelated to average nonwork goal completion and even negatively related to average work goal completion. It appears that flextime use has some benefits when used occasionally, but loses its benefit when used chronically.

General Discussion

In two studies, we utilized the experience-sampling methodology to investigate how daily fluctuations in the use of flextime impact processes at the work–nonwork interface. We found that daily use of flextime was related to stronger boundaries at work on the same work day only in Study 2. However, in both studies daily use of flextime was related to stronger boundaries at home. In other words, employees' work–nonwork boundaries were stronger on days when they organized their work time flexibly. In both studies, strong boundaries were positively linked with affective

well-being, and the affective benefits of strong boundaries at home (though not those of strong boundaries at work) lasted until the next day. We furthermore found that strong boundaries at home fully (Study 1) or partially (Study 2) mediated the relationship between day-specific flextime use and same-evening affective well-being, and that strong boundaries at work partially mediated this relationship in Study 2. Strong boundaries at home fully mediated the relationship between day-specific flextime use and next-evening affective well-being in Study 2. In Study 2, we further established day-specific nonwork goal completion as a partial mediator of the link between flextime use and boundary strength at work. Thus, flextime use may strengthen employees' boundaries at work by allowing them to finish nonwork goals before transitioning back to work.

Theoretical Contributions

The contributions from the current study are threefold. Most importantly, the study provides first results on the nature of the relationship between day-specific flextime use and employees' work–nonwork boundary strength, as well as the downstream consequences for affective well-being. Both the strengthening and the weakening of boundaries can be explained by social–cognitive theories of goal regulation (Marsh et al., 1998; Masicampo & Baumeister, 2011a). The impact of flextime use might depend on whether flextime increases or decreases goal conflict and thus inhibits or facilitates goal completion. The finding that day-specific flextime use is associated with stronger boundaries that in turn are associated with enhanced affective well-being suggests that flextime constitutes a valuable resource, rather than a risk factor, on a day-to-day basis.

Second, our study adds to the work–family boundary literature by emphasizing the dynamic nature of the work–nonwork interface. Substantial daily variability in affect (e.g., Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler, & Schilling, 1989) and boundary strength at home in the

form of psychological detachment from work (e.g., [Sonnentag & Bayer, 2005](#)) have been previously established. However, to our knowledge, our study is the first to demonstrate substantial variability in flextime use across days: about 50% (Study 1) and 24% (Study 2) of the variance in flextime use could be attributed to within-person variability. Apparently, employees do not use the temporal flexibility they are offered to the same extent every single day. Prior research on workplace flexibility has exclusively relied on cross-sectional data, relating the general availability or use of workplace flexibility or work–nonwork boundary strength to specific outcomes ([Costa et al., 2006](#); [Eek & Axmon, 2013](#)). Our results, in contrast, suggest that while flextime availability is defined by permanent policies, flextime use fluctuates regularly, reflecting day-specific work and nonwork demands. Based on these findings, future research should take into account periodic variations in employees' perceptions and actual use of workplace flexibility. Distinguishing pure day-level and person-level relationships might help overcome the inconsistent results on workplace flexibility and boundary strength from earlier cross-sectional research (e.g., [Allen et al., 2013](#)).

Our supplemental analyses furthermore point to the utility of distinguishing levels of analysis in processes at the work–nonwork interface. While both day-specific (Level 1) and chronic (Level 2) use of flextime were related to stronger boundaries at work and at home, the relationship with goal completion was more complex. Whereas day-specific flexibility use was positively related to nonwork goal completion and unrelated to work goal completion (Level 1), enduring flextime use was negatively related to work goal completion and unrelated to nonwork goal completion (Level 2). In other words, employees may benefit from occasional flextime use by reaching more nonwork goals. However, employees with chronic flextime use may no longer experience benefits for nonwork goal completion and may instead experience costs in that they attained fewer work goals. Two explanations might apply. First, flexibility may turn into a resource-depleting demand when used chronically because it may require high levels of self-organization and coordination, given that neither employees nor their social partners (colleagues or family members) can rely on an established daily temporal routine. Second, the occasional and chronic use of flextime might occur for substantially different reasons. Occasional flextime users may reduce their work hours on specific days to accommodate specific nonwork demands. Chronic users, on the other hand, might have enduring nonwork demands we did not control for (e.g., caregiving commitments) that draw time and energy resources away from work. Future studies should follow up on these various explanations to better understand the disjoint relationships between flextime use and goal completion at different levels of analysis.

Third, we offer explanations for mechanisms underlying the associations between daily flextime use and daily well-being. Specifically, the relationship between day-specific flextime use and affective well-being was mediated by a stronger boundary at home and the relationship between flextime use and boundary strength at work was mediated by more nonwork goal completion. Overall, we note that a strong boundary at home appears to be more crucial for affective well-being than a strong boundary at work. The former might be more sensitive and its violation more detrimental for people's well-being. Similar asymmetric results were found in a cross-sectional study that revealed strong boundaries at home to be related to less work-from-family conflict but

unrelated to family-to-work conflict ([Lapierre, Hammer, Truxillo, & Murphy, 2012](#)). In general, employees have been shown to more often report work interference with home than the other way round ([Allen et al., 2014](#)).

Further analyses that controlled for day-specific working hours suggest that the effects of flextime use on boundary strength and affective well-being cannot solely be attributed to changes in how much time employees spend working. Although in Study 1, the positive relationship between day-specific flextime use and boundary strength at home was no longer significant when we controlled for day-specific working hours, the positive association between day-specific boundary strength at home and positive affect remained significant. Additionally, in Study 2, the day-level relationships between flextime use, work–nonwork boundary strength, and affective well-being remained even after controlling for day-specific working hours. A reason for these differential findings for the two samples could be that the sample in Study 2 is more heterogeneous with regards to flextime availability. Thus, employees in Study 2 may have more options to enact flexibility. In line with this assumption, our analyses show that employees in Study 2 (but not in Study 1) reported to have taken more and longer breaks on days when they made use of flextime. In sum, our findings suggest that daily flextime use benefits employees not only because of adjustments in the amount of time spent working on a given day. Rather, it may be the combined effect of perceptions of control over and the actual adjustment of when and for how long employees engage in work and nonwork life domains.

Practical Implications

Organizations across the globe increasingly offer flextime options to help employees reconcile competing work and nonwork demands. Our data suggest that flextime options may indeed benefit employees. Occasional flextime use allows employees to finish nonwork goals before starting their work, which strengthens boundaries at work; strong work–nonwork boundaries in turn have favorable effects on affective well-being during both work and nonwork times. In order to improve employees' affective well-being and effectiveness, organizations therefore should offer flextime options and supervisors should encourage their team members to actively make use of such options, for example by creating a team climate where using flextime is acceptable.

Yet, our data also show that flextime use no longer benefits employees when used chronically, as it may hinder goal completion at work, which in turn weakens work–nonwork boundaries. Accordingly, organizations would benefit from supporting their employees' boundary management by encouraging employees to establish a daily temporal routine and to deviate from it only when needed. Employees who struggle with a daily temporal routine might benefit from time structuring (e.g., through core hours, *jour fixes*) provided by the organization as those chronic flextime users would save resources that normally go into coordinating with colleagues and family members. Given the mediating role of goal completion we found, goal-setting trainings may be useful to enhance the skills of setting concrete, operationalizable goals that can be achieved in the available work or nonwork time so as to reduce interdomain transitions (e.g., [Gibson, 2006](#)). Also, "job crafting" trainings have become available that help using work-

place flexibility to align work goals with individual capabilities (Demerouti, van Eeuwijk, Snelder, & Wild, 2011), as well as interventions that directly target self-efficacy perceptions (Stamov-Roßnagel & Jeske, 2016); those latter trainings improve goal-setting behaviors over and above mere goal-setting trainings and may therefore complement the former.

Strengths, Limitations, and Future Research

Strengths of this research include twice-daily measurements (Study 1), two independent, large samples, and measurements over two working weeks in both studies that allowed assessing processes at the work–nonwork interface and current affect much more precisely than retrospective, memory-based reports ever could (Robinson & Clore, 2002). Participants could rely on episodic knowledge or “autobiographical experiences” almost as these happened and therefore did not have to make generalizations on their typical flextime use, goal completion, work–nonwork boundaries or affect. Another strength is the use of MSEM in Mplus, allowing for the simultaneous estimation of multiple affective outcomes which covary with one another, and for calculating nonconfounded estimates of within and between-level components of indirect effects (Preacher et al., 2010). The highly specific operationalization of flextime use and boundary strength, and the disentangling of within and between-person relationships estimate the associations between the constructs with the best possible precision.

Our study also has several limitations. First, like many colleagues (e.g., Breevaart, Bakker, & Demerouti, 2014; Wang et al., 2013), we relied on self-reports, which may increase common method variance (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Although the use of common methods does not seem to inflate correlations significantly (Spector, 2006), we included in our models lagged relationships between variables to reduce response biases from same-time assessments (Ohly et al., 2010). Besides, day-specific boundary strength and affect reflect internal attitudes and states (Crompton & Wagner, 1994) that are most appropriately rated by respondents themselves. Future studies could complement self-reports with others’ ratings. After all, employees might view their blurred life domains different from their spouses or supervisors. Affect ratings could be complemented by physiological indicators (e.g., heart rate variability, Parker, Laurie, Newton, & Jimmieson, 2014). Further, although we experience-sampled across two working weeks and assessed some variables at different measurement occasions, we cannot infer causality.

Second, we did not distinguish boundaries as either cognitive or behavioral, nor did we specify whether boundaries are the result of passive or active processes. Future studies should investigate the impact of flextime use on different types of boundaries such as cognitive, behavioral, spatial, and temporal boundaries (Clark, 2000). Further, Kreiner (2006) observed that employees can actively manage their work–nonwork boundaries using a variety of strategies. Assessing such active boundary management strategies and their moderating or mediating roles in the relationship between workplace flexibility and boundary strength would be fruitful topics.

Third, the current studies focused only on temporal flexibility. As many employees work from home (Madden & Jones, 2008), it would be worthwhile to extend research to *spatial* flexibility and its effect on goal completion, boundary strength, and affect. We believe future studies should be carried out in other employment sectors with more flexible work environments characterized by high availability norms and the option to work from home, such as the consultancy sector.

This would allow for testing the boundary conditions of the relationships we identified. Flextime use might not strengthen boundaries at very high levels of flexibility or when coupled with spatial flexibility. Although we tested our assumptions in two independent samples, all participants were German office workers, which limits inferences about other industries or cultures. For example, physicians might have stronger boundaries at work than academic researchers, given that physicians have neither their treatment units nor their patients at home. Physicians might however be less flexible with start and end times. Also, people from different occupational sectors may use flextime for different reasons. Service providers may use flextime to meet client needs, while knowledge workers may do so for personal reasons. Future research could address such differences.

It would also be interesting to generalize our findings to various cultural settings. For instance, characteristics of the work–nonwork interface as well as the degree of boundary strength might differ between individualistic and collectivistic countries (Allen et al., 2014). Differences in legislation and labor union influence might be related to differences in working time policies between countries. Further, the scarce German childcare facilities with their limited nursery opening hours might restrict flextime use. Hence, future studies should explore the role of flexibility options in nonwork life (e.g., daycare, spouse’s working time arrangement) and their impact on boundary strength at work over and above flexibility in work life which may depend more on the occupational sector.

Lastly, future research may investigate possible moderating variables such as sleep (Sonnentag & Binnewies, 2013), segmentation preferences, telework, or norms to be available outside regular work hours (Dettmers, Vahle-Hinz, Bamberg, Friedrich, & Keller, 2016; Janke et al., 2014). Given that the effect sizes of our models at the within-person level were rather small according to Cohen’s (1988) conventional criteria, such moderator effects would be fruitful directions for future research to increase the variance explained in work–nonwork boundary strength and the resulting affective well-being.

Conclusion

The current experience-sampling study advances theory and empirical knowledge on the association between flextime use and affective well-being both at the workplace and at home. Our findings suggest that flextime use varies substantially from one day to the next, and that using flextime on a given day strengthens work–nonwork boundaries that day, as it allows for completing goals from one life domain before transitioning back to the other domain. Strong boundaries, in turn, predicted better affective well-being. Given the divergent findings at the two levels of analysis, organizations are well-advised to monitor how employees implement general flexibility policies. Flextime use appears to benefit employee well-being at the day-level, but its enduring use might hinder work goal completion. Employees should be given the flexibility to accommodate day-specific work and nonwork demands on a daily basis, but should be encouraged to use flexibility carefully.

References

- Albertsen, K., Rafnsdottir, G. L., Grimsø, A., Tomasson, K., & Kauppinen, K. (2008). Workhours and worklife balance. *Scandinavian Jour-*

- nal of Work, Environment & Health*, 2008, 14–21. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs00420-013-0857-x>
- Allen, T., Cho, E., & Meier, L. L. (2014). Work-family boundary dynamics. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 99–121. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091330>
- Allen, T., Johnson, R. C., Kiburz, K. M., & Shockley, K. M. (2013). Work-family conflict and flexible work arrangements: Deconstructing flexibility. *Personnel Psychology*, 66, 345–376. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/peps.12012>
- Ashforth, B., Kreiner, G., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25, 472–491.
- Baethge, A., & Rigotti, T. (2013). Interruptions to workflow: Their relationship with irritation and satisfaction with performance, and the mediating roles of time pressure and mental demands. *Work and Stress*, 27, 43–63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2013.761783>
- Bakker, A. B. (2014). Daily fluctuations in work engagement an overview and current directions. *European Psychologist*, 19, 227–236. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000160>
- Bakker, A. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2010). Where to go from here: Integration and future research on work engagement. In A. Bakker & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 181–196). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Baltes, B., Briggs, T., Huff, J., Wright, J., & Neuman, G. (1999). Flexible and compressed workweek schedules: A meta-analysis of their effects on work-related criteria. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 496–513. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.4.496>
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173–1182. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173>
- Bolger, N., DeLongis, A., Kessler, R. C., & Schilling, E. A. (1989). Effects of daily stress on negative mood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 808–818. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.5.808>
- Bolger, N., & Laurenceau, J. (2013). *Intensive longitudinal methods: An introduction to diary and experience sampling research*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Boudreaux, M. J., & Ozer, D. J. (2013). Goal conflict, goal striving, and psychological well-being. *Motivation and Emotion*, 37, 433–443. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s1031-012-9333-2>
- Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2014). Daily self-management and employee work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 84, 31–38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.11.002>
- Bulger, C. A., Matthews, R. A., & Hoffman, M. E. (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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.4.365>
- Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 169–198. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.08.009>
- Carlson, D. S., & Frone, M. R. (2003). Relation of behavioral and psychological involvement to a new four-factor conceptualization of work-family interference. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17, 515–535. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1023404302295>
- Carver, C., & Scheier, M. (1981). *Attention and self-regulation: A control-theory approach to human behavior*. New York, NY: Springer. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5887-2>
- Carver, C., & Scheier, M. (1990). Origins and functions of positive and negative affect. A control-process view. *Psychological Review*, 97, 19–35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.97.1.19>
- Clark, S. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53, 747–770. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726700536001>
- Clark, S. (2002). Communicating across the work/home border. *Community, Work & Family*, 5, 23–48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13668800020006802>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Costa, G., Akerstedt, T., Nachreiner, F., Frings-Dresen, M., Folkard, S., Gadbois, C., & Kandolin, I. (2003). *As time goes by—Flexible work hours, health and wellbeing. final report for SALTSA (CD)*. Stockholm, Sweden: National Institute for Working Life.
- Costa, G., Sartori, S., & Akerstedt, T. (2006). Influence of flexibility and variability of working hours on health and well-being. *Chronobiology International*, 23, 1125–1137. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07420520601087491>
- Crampton, S. M., & Wagner, J. A., III. (1994). Percept-percept inflation in microorganizational research: An investigation of prevalence and effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 67–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.1.67>
- Cropley, M., & Purvis, L. J. M. (2003). Job strain and rumination about work issues during leisure time: A diary study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 195–207. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13594320344000093>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2015). Productive and counterproductive job crafting: A daily diary study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20, 457–469. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039002>
- Demerouti, E., van Eeuwig, E., Snelder, M., & Wild, U. (2011). Assessing the effects of a “personal effectiveness” training on psychological capital, assertiveness and self-awareness using self-other agreement. *Career Development International*, 16, 60–81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13620431111107810>
- Desrochers, S., Hilton, J., & Larwood, L. (2005). Preliminary validation of the Work-Family Integration-Blurring Scale. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26, 442–466. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X04272438>
- Dettmers, J., Vahle-Hinz, T., Bamberg, E., Friedrich, N., & Keller, M. (2016). Extended work availability and its relation with start-of-day mood and cortisol. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21, 105–118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039602>
- Döhl, V., Kratzer, N., & Sauer, D. (2000). Krise der NormalArbeit(s)Politik. Entgrenzung der Arbeit - neue Anforderungen an Betriebspolitik [Crisis of “common” labor policy: De-bordering of work—new challenges for management policy]. *WSI-Mitteilungen*, 53, 5–17.
- Drobnič, S., & Rodríguez Guillén, A. (2011). *Work-life balance in Europe. The role of job quality*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230307582>
- Edwards, J., & Rothbard, N. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 178–199.
- Eek, F., & Axmon, A. (2013). Attitude and flexibility are the most important work place factors for working parents' mental wellbeing, stress, and work engagement. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 41, 692–705. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1403494813491167>
- Emmons, R., King, L., & Sheldon, K. (1993). Goal conflict and the self-regulation of action. In D. Wegner & J. Pennebaker (Eds.), *Handbook of mental control* (pp. 528–551). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Enders, C. K., & Tofighi, D. (2007). Centering predictor variables in cross-sectional multilevel models: A new look at an old issue. *Psychological Methods*, 12, 121–138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.12.2.121>

- Etzion, D., Eden, D., & Lapidot, Y. (1998). Relief from job stressors and burnout: Reserve service as a respite. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 577–585. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.4.577>
- Eurofound. (2013). *3rd European company survey*. Retrieved from www.eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_publication/field_ef_document/ef1502en_0.pdf
- Fisher, G. G., Bulger, C. A., & Smith, C. S. (2009). Beyond work and family: A measure of work/nonwork interference and enhancement. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14, 441–456. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0016737>
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. (1997). Relation of work–family conflict to health outcomes: A four-year longitudinal study of employed parents. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70, 325–335. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00652.x>
- Gibson, J. L. (2006). Employees and work-life resources: Influences on attraction, spillover, and commitment. *Dissertation Abstracts International: B. The Sciences and Engineering*, 67, 1189.
- Giebel, O., Wirtz, A., & Nachreiner, F. (2008). The interference of flexible working times with the circadian temperature rhythm—A predictor of impairment to health and well-being? *Chronobiology International*, 25, 263–270. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07420520802114029>
- Gollwitzer, P., Heckhausen, H., & Steller, B. (1990). Deliberative and implemental mind-sets - cognitive tuning toward congruous thoughts and information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1119–1127. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1119>
- Hecht, T. D., & Allen, N. J. (2009). A longitudinal examination of the work-nonwork boundary strength construct. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 839–862. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.579>
- Hill, E. J., Grzywacz, J. G., Allen, S., Blanchard, V. L., Matz-Costa, C., Shulkin, S., & Pitt-Catsoupes, M. (2008). Defining and conceptualizing workplace flexibility. *Community, Work & Family*, 11, 149–163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13668800802024678>
- Hox, J. (2002). *Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hox, J. J., Moerbeek, M., Kluytmans, A., & van de Schoot, R. (2014). Analyzing indirect effects in cluster randomized trials. The effect of estimation method, number of groups and group sizes on accuracy and power. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00078>
- Hülsheger, U. R., Lang, J. W. B., Depenbrock, F., Fehrmann, C., Zijlstra, F. R. H., & Alberts, H. J. E. M. (2014). The power of presence: The role of mindfulness at work for daily levels and change trajectories of psychological detachment and sleep quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99, 1113–1128. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037702>
- Janke, I., Stamov-Roßnagel, C., & Scheibe, S. (2014). Verschimmen die Grenzen? Auswirkungen von Vertrauensarbeitszeit auf die Schnittstelle von Arbeit und Privatleben [Blurring boundaries? The impact of trust-based working time on the work/non-work interface]. *Zeitschrift für Arbeitswissenschaft*, 68, 97–105.
- Kattenbach, R., Demerouti, E., & Nachreiner, F. (2010). Flexible working times: Effects on employees' exhaustion, work–nonwork conflict and job performance. *The Career Development International*, 15, 279–295. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13620431011053749>
- Kelly, E. L., Kossek, E. E., Hammer, L. B., Durham, M., Bray, J., Chermack, K., . . . Kaskubar, D. (2008). Getting there from here: Research on the effects of work–family initiatives on work–family conflict and business outcomes. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2, 305–349. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19416520802211610>
- Kessler, E. M., & Staudinger, U. M. (2009). Affective experience in adulthood and old age: The role of affective arousal and perceived affect regulation. *Psychology and Aging*, 24, 349–362. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0015352>
- Kossek, E., Lautsch, B., & Eaton, S. (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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.07.002>
- Kossek, E., & Michel, J. (2011). APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Flexible work schedules* (pp. 535–572). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kossek, E., Ruderman, M. N., Braddy, P. W., & Hannum, K. M. (2012). Work–nonwork boundary management profiles: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81, 112–128. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.04.003>
- Kreiner, G. (2006). Consequences of work-home segmentation or integration: A person-environment fit perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 485–507. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.386>
- Lapierre, L. M., Hammer, L. B., Truxillo, D. M., & Murphy, L. A. (2012). Family interference with work and workplace cognitive failure: The mitigating role of recovery experiences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81, 227–235. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.07.007>
- Madden, N., & Jones, S. (2008). *Networked workers*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Maes, S., & Gebarth, W. (1999). Self-regulation and health-behavior: The health behavior goal model. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 343–368). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Marsh, R., Hicks, J., & Bink, M. (1998). Activation of completed, uncompleted, and partially completed intentions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 24, 350–361. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.24.2.350>
- Masicampo, E. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (2011a). Consider it done! Plan making can eliminate the cognitive effects of unfulfilled goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 667–683. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024192>
- Masicampo, E. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (2011b). Unfulfilled goals interfere with tasks that require executive functions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 300–311. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.10.011>
- Matos, K., & Galinsky, E. (2014). *2014 national study of employers*. New York, NY: Families and Work Institute. Retrieved from <http://familiesandwork.org/downloads/2014NationalStudyOfEmployers.pdf>
- Matthews, R. A., Barnes-Farrell, J. L., & Bulger, C. A. (2010). Advancing measurement of work and family domain boundary characteristics. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77, 447–460. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.05.008>
- McMenamin, T. (2007). *A time to work: Recent trends in shift work and flexible schedules*. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2007/12/art1full.pdf>
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (1998–2012). *Mplus user's guide*. 7th ed. Los Angeles, CA: Author.
- Nezlek, J. (2012). Multilevel modeling analyses of diary-style data. In R. Mehl & T. Conner (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods for studying daily life* (pp. 357–383). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Ohly, S., Sonnentag, S., Niessen, C., & Zapf, D. (2010). Diary studies in organizational research: An introduction and some practical recommendations. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 9, 79–93. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000009>
- Olson-Buchanan, J., & Boswell, W. (2006). Blurring boundaries: Correlates of integration and segmentation between work and nonwork. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 432–445. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.006>
- Parker, S. L., Laurie, K. R., Newton, C. J., & Jimmieson, N. L. (2014). Regulatory focus moderates the relationship between task control and physiological and psychological markers of stress: A work simulation study. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 94, 390–398. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2014.10.009>
- Pickshaas, K., Schmitthöner, H., & Urban, H. J. (2001). *Arbeiten ohne Ende: Neue Arbeitsverhältnisse und gewerkschaftliche Arbeitspolitik*

- [Working with no limits: New forms of work and union-oriented labor policy]. Hamburg, Germany: VSA.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879–903. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Powell, G., & Greenhaus, J. (2010). Sex, gender, and the work-to-family interface: Exploring negative and positive interdependencies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 513–534. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2010.51468647>
- Preacher, K. J., Zyphur, M. J., & Zhang, Z. (2010). A general multilevel SEM framework for assessing multilevel mediation. *Psychological Methods*, 15, 209–233. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020141>
- Reis, H., & Wheeler, L. (1991). Advances in experimental social psychology. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Studying social interaction with the Rochester interaction record* (pp. 270–318). San Diego, CA: Academic Press. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60332-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60332-9)
- Robinson, M. D., & Clore, G. L. (2002). Belief and feeling: Evidence for an accessibility model of emotional self-report. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 934–960. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.6.934>
- Rothbard, N., Phillips, K., & Dumas, T. (2005). Managing multiple roles: Work-family policies and individuals' desires for segmentation. *Organization Science*, 16, 243–258. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1050.0124>
- Rothbard, N., & Ramarajan, L. (2009). Checking your identities at the door? positive relationships between nonwork and work identities. In L. Roberts & J. Dutton (Eds.), *Exploring positive identities and organizations: Building a theoretical and research foundation* (pp. 125–148). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Russell, J. A. (1980). A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 1161–1178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0077714>
- Sanz-Vergel, A. I., Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Moreno-Jimenez, B. (2011). Daily detachment from work and home: The moderating effect of role salience. *Human Relations*, 64, 775–799. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726710393368>
- Schieman, S., & Young, M. (2010). Is there a downside to schedule control for the work-family interface? *Journal of Family Issues*, 31, 1391–1414. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X10361866>
- Sonnentag, S. (2012). Psychological detachment from work during leisure time: The benefits of mentally disengaging from work. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21, 114–118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721411434979>
- Sonnentag, S., & Bayer, U. V. (2005). Switching off mentally: Predictors and consequences of psychological detachment from work during off-job time. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10, 393–414. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.393>
- Sonnentag, S., & Binnewies, C. (2013). Daily affect spillover from work to home: Detachment from work and sleep as moderators. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83, 198–208. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.03.008>
- Sonnentag, S., Binnewies, C., & Mojza, E. J. (2008). "Did you have a nice evening?" A day-level study on recovery experiences, sleep, and affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 674–684. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.3.674>
- Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2007). The Recovery Experience Questionnaire: Development and validation of a measure for assessing recuperation and unwinding from work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12, 204–221. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.3.204>
- Spector, P. E. (2006). Method variance in organizational research: Truth or urban legend? *Organizational Research Methods*, 9, 221–232. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1094428105284955>
- Stamov-Roßnagel, C., & Jeske, D. (2016). Successful ageing in the workplace. A resources-oriented intervention perspective. In L. Riby (Ed.), *Handbook of gerontology research methods: Understanding successful ageing* (pp. 95–117). London, UK & New York, NY: Routledge.
- Syrek, C. J., & Antoni, C. H. (2014). Unfinished tasks foster rumination and impair sleeping - particularly if leaders have high performance expectations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19, 490–499. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037127>
- Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work family conflict and strain. A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 6–15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.1.6>
- Voydanoff, P. (2005). Consequences of boundary-spanning demands and resources for work-to-family conflict and perceived stress. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10, 491–503. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.491>
- Wang, M., Liu, S., Liao, H., Gong, Y., Kammeyer-Mueller, J., & Shi, J. (2013). Can't get it out of my mind: Employee rumination after customer mistreatment and negative mood in the next morning. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98, 989–1004. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0033656>
- Wright, T., Bonett, D., & Sweeney, D. (1993). Mental-health and work performance. Results of a longitudinal-field study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 66, 277–284. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1993.tb00539.x>
- Zeigarnik, B. (1927). Das Behalten erledigter und unerledigter Handlungen [Remembering finished and unfinished actions]. *Psychologische Forschung*, 9, 1–85.

Received November 21, 2014

Revision received July 8, 2016

Accepted July 11, 2016 ■

E-Mail Notification of Your Latest Issue Online!

Would you like to know when the next issue of your favorite APA journal will be available online? This service is now available to you. Sign up at <http://notify.apa.org/> and you will be notified by e-mail when issues of interest to you become available!