Gender differences in remote work: a study on the boundary management tactics of women and men

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Gender differences in remote work: a study on the boundary management tactics of women and men

Structured Abstract

Design

We use secondary data, and we conduct a thematic analysis, to identify whether and how women and men negotiate differently.

Purpose

Our aim is to identify potential differences in experiences and their causes from a gender-based perspective.

Findings

Despite remote work being considered as creating a level-playing field for both genders, women are still vulnerable to work and life demands, and pre-existing stereotypes become exacerbated. In addition, we show how technology might be used to manage physical and temporal boundaries, through integration or segmentation tactics.

Originality

There is a growing body of literature that focuses on work-life conflict among teleworkers. Yet, there is limited research that explores such conflicts from a gender perspective, specifically whether and how different genders manage boundaries between work and life differently.

Keywords: remote work, work-home conflict, boundary theory, gender

1. Introduction

Studies on remote work, before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, have shown that there are signs of increased gender inequality. Generally speaking, flexible work patterns such as remote work have always been heralded as facilitating women's access to the labour market (Sullivan, 2012). Under normal circumstances, remote work facilitates the integration of work and family life, whereby studies have shown that it can provide the necessary work-life balance and reduce work-family conflicts (Rau and Hyland, 2002). At the same time, however, remote work often reinforces stereotypical gender roles, whereby women are expected (more than men) to undertake care responsibilities of family members (Melissa *et al.*, 2020).

To date, the literature has examined the way remote workers move across boundaries, the way they transition between them and enact different roles, and the outcomes of such role transition in terms of productivity, well-being, and conflicts between family and work. Yet, less attention has been paid to how remote workers manage the boundaries and what are the implications of their management styles, especially from a gender perspective (Otonkorpi-Lehtoranta *et al.*, 2022). Against this background, the question that arises is whether there are any gender-based differences in how boundaries between work and personal life are perceived, experienced and acted upon. In this study, we adopt a gender perspective to explore the above and understand whether women and men remote workers adopt different management tactics to overcome work-life conflicts.

We adopt the theoretical lens of Boundary Theory as an entry point in our study, as it allows us to explore work and family as two relatively separate domains (Senarathne Tennakoon, da Silveira and Taras, 2013) and to explore the causes and the management tactics of work-family

conflict (Bulger, Matthews and Hoffman, 2007). In drawing from a secondary data analysis, we unpack the different boundary management tactics, and we show that, on the one hand, complete segmentation and complete integration are difficult to achieve and that both genders prefer to separate work from personal life, but only men remote workers can achieve this to some extent. In addition, our findings indicate that men remote workers tend to adopt segmentation tactics, which are conducive to conflict management whereas women opt for partial integration which allows them to balance work and family better.

We consider that our findings provide significant insights regarding gender differences in remote work and work-life balance as they reveal how women and men experience boundaries between work and family in different ways, as well as how they leverage technology in doing so. Following the pandemic, more and more workers consciously choose remote work over more traditional work patterns (Marston *et al.*, 2021) and this suggests that the boundaries between work and personal life will continue being permeable whereby work, family and leisure will continue disrupting each other. It is thus necessary to analyse and explore the source of conflicts and the tactics that remote workers may adopt towards reducing such conflicts, as this will facilitate securing a balance between work and everyday life and improving productivity and wellbeing (Golden and Gajendran, 2019; Franken *et al.*, 2021).

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Remote Work, Gender and Work-Family Conflict

The relationship between work and family life should be viewed as a two-way dyadic relationship whereby work interferes with family life and family interferes with work (Gutek,

Searle and Klepa, 1991). Work-family conflict has been described as a role conflict that arises

when the demands of the work domain affect the home domain (Andrade and Lousã, 2021),

whereas family-work conflict suggests implications for the work domain due to family duties.

Although these two concepts are similar, they have different causes and thus different

consequences. For example, work-family conflict may cause stress on employees, who in turn

may exhibit absenteeism at work, whereas family-work conflict may lead to other forms of

behaviours, such as leaving early to attend to family demands (Boyar, Maertz and Pearson,

2005).

To date, remote work has been largely treated as having a positive effect on work-life balance

and by extension on conflicts between the work and the home domains. By often being a

flexible work modality, remote work facilitates scheduling work around family responsibilities

and personal needs (Vilhelmson and Thulin, 2016). This then allows remote workers to improve

their work-life balance (Madsen, 2003), because, as long as they can complete their tasks and

meet organisational demands, they can enjoy their family and have leisure time, under a

relatively lax supervision arrangement (Hilbrecht *et al.*, 2013). In other words, remote work is

often seen as helping reduce conflicts between the two domains.

Yet more recent studies show that remote work poses a risk towards exacerbating work-family

conflict. Remote workers often exhibit a higher degree of enthusiasm for their work and thus

invest more time into that compared to on-site workers (Felstead and Henseke, 2017). They are

also often expected to engage more with unpaid work under the premise of autonomy, which

can lead to stress (Seiz, 2021). In addition, as remote work typically takes place at home, it is

difficult for remote workers to differentiate and manage the boundaries between the work and

the home domain, both physical and virtual (Andrade and Lousã, 2021). During the COVID-19 lockdown, remote workers were expected to share space and resources with all family members, during work and outside work, and evidence indicates that in many cases this increased work-life conflict, exhaustion and negative implications to one's wellbeing (Platts, Breckon and Marshall, 2022).

At the same time, however, studies often highlight that whether conflict increases or decreases, often relates to gendered roles and gender differences more generally. Remote work has been heralded as empowering women to enter the labour market, but also as exacerbating inequalities. Hou et al. (Hou *et al.*, 2022), for example, argue that remote work can help reduce gender inequalities in the labour market. This, however, is contingent on several contextual conditions and personal circumstances. On the one hand, remote work has introduced flexibility and therefore it is often seen as helping women break away from traditional gender-based roles and balance work and family life (Holloway, 2007). Indeed, remote work can be a useful work modality to enter the labour market, under certain conditions, such as low-income households (Hou *et al.*, 2022) and rural or hard-to-reach areas where work opportunities can be exceptionally few (Malik *et al.*, 2021). Yet, it can also reinforce inequalities and multiply the negative implications because there still exists an unequal distribution of household chores and caring responsibilities between women and men (Alon *et al.*, 2020). Further to this, this unequal distribution reduces the choices that women have concerning employment, who often take up remote work on a part-time basis, which allows balancing family and work, but is typically less well-paid and can be stressful for women remote workers (Emslie and Hunt, 2009).

During the pandemic, work-life balance became even more challenging for women, and women remote workers in particular (Cui, Ding and Zhu, 2022). During the pandemic, the school and day-care closure entailed that working parents had to take on greater caring responsibilities, but women were more likely to undertake these (Eurofound, 2020). This resulted in women spending more time doing unpaid care work, and being more likely to change their work patterns (e.g., move from full-time to part-time contracts) (Xue and McMunn, 2021). Therefore, while remote work may offer increased opportunities for women's employment (Sullivan and Lewis, 2001a) and gender equality in the labour market, stereotypical gender roles reproduce themselves and the Covid-19 pandemic reinforced them further (Arntz, Ben Yahmed and Berlingieri, 2020).

In other words, there are certain contradictory findings in the literature in terms of remote work and conflict, and one could argue that remote work does not fundamentally address the conflicts between work and family in the same way between women and men, possibly because differences in the expectations, external pressures and the availability of resources (Kreiner, 2006) that impact remote workers of different genders.

2.2. Boundary Theory: boundaries, roles and conflicts

Boundary theory can serve as a useful theoretical foundation for understanding in greater depth how differences in expectations, external pressures and resources due to gender can influence how boundaries between work and life are experienced and how they are negotiated, as well as preferences and outcomes of boundary management tactics (Shanine, Eddleston and Combs, 2019).

7

Boundaries commonly refer to the borders that workers use to distinguish between different domains or different parts of domains (Nippert-Eng, 1996; Ashforth, Kreiner and Fugate, 2000). Work and family are two such domains, whereby there is a boundary that functions as a dividing line between the two. Such boundaries can be physical, temporal and psychological ones. Physical boundaries define the physical aspect of activities, temporal boundaries define the order of activities, and psychological boundaries may denote thinking styles, behavioural habits and others (Dumas and Sanchez-Burks, 2015), whereby psychological boundaries might be influenced by how a worker engages with physical and temporal boundaries. Boundary theory, in turn, suggests that workers are often involved in different domains, e.g., work, family, and personal life and that they create boundaries between these but are required to constantly enact and switch between different roles as a situation evolves (Ashforth, Kreiner and Fugate, 2000). Boundaries, irrespective of their nature, are characterised by the properties of permeability and flexibility (Clark, 2000). Permeability refers to the extent to which one domain may interfere with another (e.g., work interferes with family). For example, when considering psychological boundaries, permeability may describe the extent to which a worker becomes involved in a family-related role (Hall and Richter, 1988; Beach, 1989). This might take the form of family members engaging the worker during their work (e.g., by entering their physical home office space), which makes the boundary permeable. Flexibility, in turn, reflects the degree to which it is psychologically or physically convenient for a worker to find themselves within one domain (e.g., work) while still being able to engage with the other (Hall and Richter, 1988). For example, temporal boundaries are seen as being flexible when work happens while taking care of family members. These two properties together determine the strength of a boundary.

Strong boundaries are characterised by low permeability and low flexibility, i.e., they are not

susceptible to being penetrated by other actors and they are difficult to be adjusted to the needs

of others. Weak boundaries are characterised by high permeability and high flexibility, and thus

vulnerable to penetration by others and easily adjusted to their needs (Clark, 2000).

The strength of these boundaries influences work-family and family-work conflicts (Kroumova,

Mittal and Bienstock, 2021). Namely, the more permeable a boundary, the greater the

likelihood of interference between work and family, and this leads to a higher likelihood of

work-family conflicts. Similarly, the more flexible the boundaries, the relationship between

family and work becomes smoother, and there is less likelihood for work-family conflicts. As

such, a combination of low permeability and high flexibility is required for minimising work-

family conflicts (Clark, 2000).

According to boundary theory, remote workers are boundary crossers because they cross

boundaries continuously as they are required to enact different roles within different domains.

Such role transitions can have a significant influence over the emergence of conflict between

the different domains, both positive and negative, depending on the form of the transition

(Delanoeije, Verbruggen and Germeys, 2019). Work-family conflict occurs as a result of the

interaction between boundary crossers and boundary keepers, i.e., those who exert influence

over the work or family boundary of the boundary crosser, such as their employer, colleagues

or family members (Clark, 2000). The work-family conflict in turn arises when boundary

crossers and boundary keepers disagree on how domains and boundaries are managed, or when

boundaries shift because of increased demands in one or both domains.

Along these lines, boundary theory suggests that there are different strategies for boundary management, and that these strategies are expected to differ based on the nature of the boundary and its strength, as well as the gender and other particularities of the boundary crosser (Kreiner, Hollensbe and Sheep, 2009a), the latter also influencing the implementation of such strategies through management tactics (Kreiner, 2006).

2.3. Personal Preferences and Boundary Management Tactics in Remote Work

Understanding and examining preferred strategies for boundary management can help understand the influence of boundaries over the balance between work and family relationships (Ashforth, Kreiner and Fugate, 2000), as well as the underlying mechanisms that give rise to different boundary management tactics.

Segregation and integration are the two main strategies that workers employ for managing the balance between work and family (Kreiner, Hollensbe and Sheep, 2009b; Cousins and Robey, 2015). Namely, segmenters see work and family as two isolated domains, and thus seek to separate them as much as possible by creating and looking to maintain clear boundaries between the two. Integrators consider the two domains as interwoven and often enact both work and family roles at the same time, allowing the two domains to penetrate each other (Kreiner, 2006). With respect to boundary properties, in conditions of low boundary permeability and low boundary flexibility, the two domains are considered entirely segregated; in contrast, when these two properties are high, then the two domains are seen as highly integrated. Prior research has found that women are more likely to combine the two domains (Sullivan and Lewis, 2001a), and therefore more likely to cross boundaries more frequently.

Studies to date have shown that some workers prefer a clear boundary between work and family (segmenters), whereas others prefer to enact multiple roles at the same time (integrators); such preferences contribute to different delineation patterns (Kreiner, 2006; Michel and Clark, 2013) and different boundary management tactics (Eddleston and Mulki, 2017). In reality, however, very few people are segmenters or integrators in absolute terms, and in most cases, their values and personal traits influence their preferences (Rothbard and Edwards, 2003). Namely, individual characteristics, such as time management skills, and personal values, such as the meaning of family to them, vary. Therefore, for example, those who value work and family similarly and have strong time management skills are more prone to be integrators, whereas those who assign different values to family and work and lack time management skills are more likely to be segregators.

Recently, the above strategies have been expanded within the context of remote workers specifically. Kashive et al. (Kashive, Sharma and Khanna, 2021) argue that remote workers may adopt four different strategies, by being boundary-fit family guardians, boundary-fit fusion lovers, work warriors or dividers. These strategies bear resemblance to the typology proposed by Kreiner et al (Kreiner, 2006): for instance, dividers can be considered as extreme segmenters, where the domains of work and family are divided by a clear boundary. However, Kashive et al.'s typology is more nuanced in that it considers the different degrees of work-family conflict and the different boundary management tactics remote workers adopt.

In terms of these tactics, Kreiner et al. (Kreiner, Hollensbe and Sheep, 2009b) proposed four different types, namely; physical, behavioural, temporal and communicative tactics. Physical tactics reflect the use of methods to manage physical boundaries, e.g., designating a specific

space as the home office. Behavioural tactics are used to control boundaries by adopting certain

habits, e.g., not checking work emails outside office hours. Temporal tactics draw boundaries

by creating a clear distinction between work time and home time, e.g., setting clear boundaries

for breaks throughout the day. Communicative tactics set rules that help reinforce boundaries

and manage expectations so that penetration of one domain into another reduces (Park, Liu and

Headrick, 2020), such as reducing noise levels when a family member has a meeting.

However, choices in terms of boundary management tactics and the way preferred strategies

are enacted relates strongly to the external pressures and the availability of resources for

engaging with any one of these (Kreiner, 2006). Remote work most typically takes place at

home, where physical boundaries collapse due to the collocation of work and family and which

requires often more frequent transitions between work- and family-related roles (Shumate and

Fulk, 2004a). In doing so, psychological boundaries may become more permeable and more

flexible with implications for the remote worker: while working from home, a remote worker

may lose concentration due to family-specific demands, or underperform in their caring duties

due to work-specific demands; in either case, this may result in feelings of guilt, loss of

concentration on the primary role (e.g., Choroszewicz and Kay, 2019; França *et al.*, 2023). In

terms of temporal boundaries, these too are impacted as more often than not, remote work

encourages working prolonged hours (Harker and MacDonnell, 2012), cannibalising personal

and leisure time (Shippen, 2014). At the same time, recent research has shown that remote

workers rarely adopt a single boundary management tactic, but instead, they often combine

them, e.g., one might adopt a physical tactic, combined with a behavioural one (e.g., working

at home from a dedicated area, while adopting an 'office' routine), with temporal tactics being more prevalent among remote workers (Allen *et al.*, 2021).

To date, there is extensive research into boundary management and gender. For example, research suggests that women are more likely to adopt integration strategies whereas men tend to adopt segmentation strategies, which confirms earlier findings (Sullivan and Lewis, 2001b; Paustian-Underdahl *et al.*, 2016). Cousins and Robey (Cousins and Robey, 2015) found that segmentation and integration exist along a continuum rather than being entirely distinguishable strategies, and identified diverse tactics that reflect both of these across and within domains (family, work), and that these can often change over time. However, not much is known about how these relate to the particularities of the various forms of boundaries (physical, psychological, temporal), nor how these are used by different genders to transition across roles and boundaries. For example, while Kashive et al.'s typology considers the different boundary management tactics remote workers adopt, the positive/negative family-to-work spillover effects, and the gender composition of the clusters reflecting each of the proposed tactics, it does not meaningfully engage with gender-based preferences across the clusters (e.g., whether women seem to prefer one tactic over another). Yet, this is an important consideration because "gender may affect how remote workers manage the work– family interface", which in turn can influence remote work experience and performance, and thus result in different outcomes for the genders (Eddleston and Mulki, 2017, p. 348).

To address the above, it is important to explore how the different genders experience and negotiate boundaries, and how external pressures and resources lend themselves to different boundary management tactics. This is because a) management tactics relate strongly to whether

there are conflicts between family and work and how they are managed (Ashforth, Kreiner and Fugate, 2000) and b) the external pressures and the available resources that influence tactic choices (Kreiner, 2006) typically differ between genders (for example, women traditionally experience more pressure in meeting family needs (Shanine, Eddleston and Combs, 2019)).

3. Method

The purpose of this study is to explore whether there are gender-based differences between women and men in how they experience boundaries between work and family, and how they manage and negotiate these to avoid conflicts between the work and home domains. We address the above through the secondary analysis of the dataset prepared for the project "Where Does Work Belong Anymore? The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Working in the UK, 2020-2021" (Marks *et al.*, 2021). This project combined in-depth interviews with 136 participants, with a questionnaire-based survey to offer insights into the remote work experience in the UK, while participants were working from home due to the lockdown. The focus of the study was to understand the daily lives of remote workers, the socio-cultural environment in which they lived and work and the impact of these on their attitudes and behaviours. Each participant was interviewed four times across the duration of the project to examine whether the remote work experience changed over time. The Covid-19 pandemic required that workers who could work remotely should do so to minimise the spread of the virus and its implications. In addition, school closures entailed an increase in caring responsibilities. On the one hand, this necessitated a redistribution of caring and household responsibilities, and on the other hand, early experiences showed that despite work circumstances changing similarly for all, women and

14

men still did not experience remote work in the same way (Flaherty, 2020; Barua, 2022; Çoban, 2022). As such, this dataset is particularly useful in that it enables us to explore whether gender influences how workers transitioned between the different roles they had to enact and whether, based on gender, there are differences in their boundary management tactics, at a time where presumably both women and men had similar access to remote work.

As our aim of the study entails exploring the work-family interface, and the experiences and behaviours of remote workers, we adopted an interpretive thematic analysis as our approach to analyse the collated interviews, using the NVivo software package. We chose the method of thematic analysis because of its ability to produce rich and reliable insights (Braun and Clarke, 2006) and to establish similarities and differences among the various experiences and perspectives (King, 2004). We, therefore, followed an overall approach to our coding that is influenced and inspired by prior literature on boundary theory and remote work, while remaining open to new concepts and meanings stemming from the empirical material.

Of the 136 project participants, we sampled 20 participants in total. For sampling purposes, we followed theoretical sampling (Urquhart, 2012), a commonly used technique in qualitative research (e.g., Zamani et al., 2022). Theoretical sampling allows researchers to identify what data to collect based on the nature and quality of the categories emerging from the data (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). The aim is to increase understanding of each emerging category, as well as validate their usefulness and relevance in terms of the continuously evolving coding scheme (Urquhart, 2012). In our study, we began our analysis by sampling only women participants (4 participants, considering all 4 interview instances, i.e., 16 interviews in total) to identify adopted boundary management strategies. This preliminary analysis indicated the importance

of segmentation as a prominent strategy. Considering this in relation to the extant literature, we

moved on to the second phase of the analysis with two objectives: a) to selectively sample

around the segmentation category in mind (Glaser, 1978) to achieve saturation (Hennink,

Kaiser and Marconi, 2017) in terms of the linkage between segmentation and boundaries, and

b) to identify alternative strategies, specifically integration strategies, and thus exploring the

boundary conditions for each (i.e., what are the underlying factors that dictate the use of one

strategy over the other and what might be the differences between them). This resulted in

sampling 6 more women participants (24 additional interviews) because, after this point,

subsequent interviews did not contribute substantially new concepts and themes, i.e., saturation

was achieved. The criterion we used to examine saturation was that of code meaning as it is

the most applicable approach for the nature of our study, whereby we were not interested in

identifying all possible boundary management strategies and their nuances, but instead, we

were interested in achieving a full understanding of the underlying differences in terms of the

nature of boundaries and the influence of gender differences among the more popular ones. We

examined for code meaning by reviewing the collated interviews following a cross-participant

analysis and looking for differences in terms of how boundaries were being negotiated, different

aspects of personal circumstances (e.g., caring/no caring responsibilities), whereby subsequent

interviews (after the first 10) did not provide any further nuance in our understanding.

We concluded sampling by selectively sampling men participants who exhibited a preference

for similar boundary management strategies to identify any differences in their execution that

could be meaningfully explained due to gender-based differences. Table 1 provides a

description of the final sample and Table 2 provides an overview of our approach to data analysis.

Table 1. Description of sample

No.	Name	Gender	Occupation	Living with a partner	Children at home	Total duration (in minutes)	Total wordcount
1	Jess	W	Finance Associate	N	N	249.0	42,819
2	Sara	W	Business Analyst	Y	N	265.0	43,004
3	Trish	W	Consultant	Y	Y	201.0	26,855
4	Sue	W	IT Professional	N	N	295.0	39,866
5	Vanessa	W	Team Manager	Y	Y	209.0	35,613
6	Meghan	W	Public Relations (freelance)	Y	Y	116.0	27,701
7	Heidi	W	IT Professional	Y	N	246.0	43,603
8	Eleonora	W	Business Analyst	Y	Y	181.0	28,677
9	Nancy	W	Project Manager	Y	Y	247.0	40,140
10	Ana	W	Teacher	N	N	210.0	31,150
11	Sundeep	M	IT Professional	Y	Y	275.0	41,002
12	Sreejan	M	Public Health Consultant	N	N	200.0	37,192
13	Mark	M	Team Manager	Y	Y	214.0	34,516
14	Martin	M	Architect	Y	Y	250.0	36,830
15	Rob	M	Project Manager	Y	Y	296.0	54,924
16	Dave	M	IT Professional	Y	N	271.0	47,099
17	Peter	M	Complaints Officer	Y	Y	232.0	29,855
18	Paul	M	Project Manager	Y	N	228.0	41,112
19	Moran	M	IT Professional	Y	N	286.0	35,386
20	Josh	M	Consultant	N	Y	185.0	26,400

Note: W: woman, M: man, Y = yes, N = no, all names have been replaced with pseudonyms and occupations have been merged into larger categories (e.g., IT professional may reflect a Software Engineer, IT support and other IT related occupations) to avoid deanonymisation. Total duration and total word count correspond to all four interviews with the participant.

Table 2. Overview of sampling and data analysis - adapted from Polyviou & Zamani (2023)

Stage	Description of the Process
1. Familiarisation	Review of the empirical material (interviews), assignment of unique identifiers and anonymisation of material, memoing to identify preliminary ideas.
2. Initial Coding	Sampled 4 participants (women) and their interviews (16 transcripts in total) and began preliminary coding to identify boundary management strategies. Sampled 6 more participants (women) and their interviews (24 transcripts in total).
3. Identification of Themes	Cross-participants analysis to examine whether new themes and concepts emerge, and examine whether saturation has been achieved. Sampled 10 more participants and their interviews (40 transcripts in total) to identify gender-based differences in the themes.
4. Review and	The two authors reviewed the identified themes, against the relevant

17

Definition of Themes	literature to identify similarities and differences. The themes were reviewed to examine whether these are substantially different or overlapping, and to ensure they accurately reflect the topic.
5. Write up	We extracted representative quotes from the transcripts to develop the chain of evidence for the study, and used memos and descriptions to prepare the manuscript and write up the findings.

Note: While the table suggests a linear process, we note that we largely followed an iterative approach across the 5 stages, whereby we continuously moved between stages 5 and 2.

4. Findings

Table 3 presents an overview of our findings. We begin the presentation of our findings by briefly illustrating how the different types of boundaries are experienced by remote workers, by discussing their permeability and flexibility. We then move on to presenting our findings in terms of boundary management styles and tactics.

Table 3. Overview of findings

Boundaries	
Physical boundaries	Women are more likely to experience family-work conflicts (5 out of 10), whereas when men experience conflict (3 out of 10) it is work-family conflict.
Temporal boundaries	The flexibility of temporal boundaries is higher for women, as they combine family and work, fragmenting their workday (5 out of 10). Among men, only 1 participant reported similar flexibility, with the rest reporting rigid temporal boundaries.
Psychological boundaries	No significant differences between genders. Psychological boundaries seem to be used in conjunction with physical or temporal boundaries.
Boundary Management strategies	
Integration	Women are primarily integrators, often by necessity and as a result of the temporal boundaries flexibility (6 out of 10).
Segmentation	Both genders prefer segmentation strategies; whether this is achieved or not it depends on the flexibility and permeability of the boundaries, including other factors (e.g., availability of physical space). Men are mostly segmenters (7 out of 10).
Boundary Management tactics	
Physical tactics	Men are more likely to enact segmentation strategies using physical tactics (4 men compared to 2 women), such as using a dedicated space for work purposes, whereas women most often work in shared/communal spaces (8 out of 10).
Temporal tactics	No significant differences between genders, but based on childcare and other responsibilities.
Behavioural tactics	These depend on the nature of work (and therefore they are not specific to gender). Both genders make use of IT to enact these, with some variations.
Communicative tactics	Not many use such tactics, and no gender differences were identified.

4.1. Boundary Penetration and gender differences

Generally, work and family are seen as two separate domains with their own boundaries. When the workplace is collocated with the home, there is a great degree of permeability of the boundaries, often confounded by flexibility, that leads to the two domains folding into each other. This is because work and family activities occur in the same physical space, which means that the two cannot be separated at a physical level, especially in cases whereby the available space is insufficient. When the **physical boundaries** become permeable, there is a greater likelihood for conflicts between the two domains and as boundary crossers and boundary keepers interact with each other. In our analysis we observed that women were more likely to experience family-work conflict, i.e., the intrusion of work into the home domain, whereas men were more likely to experience the reverse, with conflict taking the form of frequent disruptions by family members, and resulting in increased levels of stress, and reductions in perceived productivity. In both cases, however, boundary crossers need to transition between roles more and more to meet work and family demands:

"Usually small, but often they are demands. It's "Can you fix this?" O, "My internet isn't

working." Or, you know - these are all things that I would have to get up for and break off

from - they rarely knock on the door with, would you like a cup of tea?" (Moran)

"I don't feel like it's a workspace at all really, and I can always hear [laughs] I can always

hear the kids, basically." (Rob)

While the permeability of physical boundaries can increase conflict, the flexibility of **temporal boundaries** often allows remote workers to balance work and family demands better, as they

19

are able to take a break from work to meet family needs. Temporal boundaries, like physical

boundaries are, too, experienced differently. Women seem to value being able to attend to their

family's needs by taking a break from work, whereas men considered this to be creating a

conflict with their work schedule:

"Whereas now I can take time out, make dinner, so knowing that I've taken an hour and a half

off, my seven and a half hours, later in the evening I'll log on and make up that time."

(Eleonora)

"Maybe I could do more but if I went and pushed it and said, do more French or - that would

be an intrusion of my time." (Moran)

Remote workers of both genders discussed having to deal with and enact **psychological**

boundaries, whereby both men and women seek to define work and family activities on a

psychological level, besides on physical and temporal ones. However, we observed differences

in how these are experienced and what they might be. For example, those who have accepted

the new work arrangements suggested that for them psychological boundaries may emulate or

follow the way physical ones function:

"Well it's just part of the house as normal, I mean I suppose in one way, yeah I suppose there's

a psychological door rather than you know, well there is a physical door but the physical

doors always open, but I think it's just I actually psychologically define the spaces

differently." (Josh)

Others explained how their psychological boundaries follow the patterns of temporal boundaries, i.e., sticking to their work patterns to protect their personal life:

"I feel comfortable in it, I feel, so I think that's why for me it's positive because I just feel more comfortable at work, I don't feel worse at my off-work hours. (…) Yeah. For me the moment I close my laptop really is, I don't know, I guess it's… Psychological boundary, yeah." (Sue)

In other cases, however, especially when family is seen as penetrating the work domain, which is more pronounced among men, psychological boundaries may not be as permeable, and flexibility of the boundary is subject to the criticality of what is perceived as the primary domain, i.e., work. When such flexibility is low, it often leads to feelings of anxiety and guilt of not meeting family expectations:

"But – and that's the bit that I'm finding difficult when I work from home, is if I go and make a cup of tea and he asks me to play cars, I get that guilt straight away of – my natural reaction is, I've got to go and do my work. But if I've got a video call, or something really important to come back to then I'll have to tell him, no, I've got to get on with my work and I have to just come back upstairs and shut the door. But if it is I'm just coming back to a spreadsheet, or a document I'm working on, then I might just say, yeah, I'll give it." (Rob)

4.2. Boundary Management Strategies: segmentation, integration and gender differences

As earlier noted, remote workers typically adopt boundary management strategies that exist along the continuum between segmentation and integration, rather than exclusively one of the polar opposites. Based on the analysis of our empirical material, several remote workers prefer to create strong boundaries between work and family life which are characterised by weak permeability and less flexibility, across both genders. However, we note that often strategies that are primarily segmentation-focused rely on the extent to which remote workers can achieve such segmentation based on whether physical boundaries can be leveraged, and which is often linked to one's socio-economic status (i.e., larger houses, spare rooms):

"Fortunately in the spare bedroom that we have set up as an office, so, I'm very lucky in that

respect, being able to have a place where I can literally isolate myself from the rest of the

family and their day to day activity and just kind of focus on work." (Paul)

"He is working in the kitchen. It's a very big kitchen, so, we each have our own space during

the day, so, we're not in the same room, so, that really helps. I know a lot of people have

had issues with their loved ones. But we're both lucky in that sense." (Sara)

When remote workers opt for integration strategies, they switch continuously between roles, increasing the permeability and the flexibility of the boundaries. There are several underlying reasons for adopting such strategies, including being able to multitask, keeping themselves motivated and reducing the sense of isolation, whereby some will purposefully remove any physical boundaries between work and family life:

"So, I put lunch on, came back to work, had a meeting, went back, so I keep going back and forth and that keeps me active as well, not sat all day at a desk, so, I go back and forth the kitchen." (Eleonora)

"I have meetings in the kitchen, but they are the type of meetings that I don't have to talk. The fact that I can do stuff while being in the meeting makes me feel better like I can actually focus a little bit more, because I know that I'm not a hundred percent needed and it doesn't stop me from doing anything else, but I can still follow the conversation." (Sue)

"It's been nice to be around together, so you're kind of just having a bit of company. It would be, I think everything would be a bit harder if I was sitting here at my desk on my own all day every day without [name of partner] being there, it'd be a hell of a lot harder. I'm glad I do have, it's nice to have the company." (Martin)

Yet, some women remote workers seem to have few choices, especially those with young children, where integration strategies are adopted by necessity rather than choice. They follow high integration strategies whereby they juggle work and family at the same time, because they seem to be taking up most of the childcare responsibilities, despite having a partner:

"So if she's got enough work that she can get on with by herself until the lunchtime, and then she can sit downstairs with the kids for the rest of the day, and work, literally, with her laptop on her lap, kind of, thing, then that's been working. So she does that Thursday, Friday. And then she's juggling it with her work to say, yeah, I've got the kids with me but I can still manage my work." (Rob, talking about his partner)

"Maybe but I will still be working but I'll have to fit client work round it in the evenings and

do any writing, I can almost probably get about an hours' worth of work done a day with

her maybe a bit more but it does mean putting her in front of the television, which is fine,

I'll just have to do that just to get it done." (Meghan, with reference to her daughter)

4.3. Boundary Management Tactics

The two most employed boundary management tactics are physical and temporal tactics.

Physical tactics entail the manipulation or adaptation of the physical space and/or of tangible

artefacts that can help with boundary management (Kreiner, Hollensbe and Sheep, 2009b). In

our study, such tactics pertain to drawing physical boundaries by creating a separate office

environment. Yet, as earlier noted, this necessitates that the extra space required is indeed

available. In addition, with regards to gender-based differences, men are more likely to use a

separate physical space (i.e., distinct home office space, using e.g., a spare room), whereas

women were more likely to use shared spaces (e.g., kitchen, living room) or auxiliary ones,

such as sheds.

"...when it's noisy I can just go into the shed, close the door at the end of the garden and do

client work and I can't hear them and they can't, you know, it's perfect." (Meghan)

"I'm working from the corner of our bedroom which is fine (...) you know I don't have to move

my setup every night, I move it at the weekend because I just don't want to see it but for

other people their space is so small they have to pack up of an evening so there's a dining

table or whatever." (Nancy)

24

"I think it's also, I mean I purposefully worked in a different room so you know psychologically

for me it was like I'm going into my workplace rather than, but for some people they find

that really difficult in the team and you know they were working from the kitchen table."

(Josh)

Next, and with regards to *temporal tactics*, these are employed when temporal boundaries are threatened and might involve blocking off time, postponing or bringing forward activities, including disassociating from work/home domains for some time (Kreiner, Hollensbe and Sheep, 2009b). Working prolonged hours when working remotely is a common occurrence, and participants often referred to how they were trying to set time boundaries for themselves:

"So, we realise okay, I don't care, I have to go now because it's seven o'clock and I need to

eat." (Sue)

In other cases, working outside set work hours is purposefully chosen by participants themselves. In some cases, this tactic is perceived as replacing commuting time with time dedicated for transitioning between family and work and vice versa, or for preparation ahead of the workday:

"So, usually we start at 08:30 so log on 30, 45 minutes earlier. I think it made a difference in

my morning in the sense that I felt less stressed because I had more time to stretch it over."

(Jess)

Findings also indicate that such tactics are invoked for the purpose of (re)creating routines, establishing rituals that can help maintain boundaries and support recuperation from work and an extended workday. For example, some participants have been missing walking or cycling to work and seek to recreate this routine and compensate for the missed exercise involved.

"At least three or four times a week after work I will get changed and go out for a run and then that feels like that has replaced the journey home a little bit." (Sreejan)

"I need to force myself outside for a walk at the end of work, just to - because I've got a headache from working ten hours a day, looking at the screen all the time." (Sara)

In terms of such temporal tactics, we did not observe a difference between women and men, but rather between those with and without childcare responsibilities, whereby engaging in such tactics is enforced due to such responsibilities, such as home schooling:

"it was a family exercise, we set up a plan. A timetable for what the day, ideally, what it look like, so for instance from, from 8:00 to 9:00, then like the 10:00, 10:00 – 11:00. So, we set up a timetable. We allocated certain tasks, different tasks to the timetable in the hope that that would help us to, to adhere to the plan. So although we had the plan if you look at what happened in reality it didn't really work out the way we wanted." (Peter)

Behavioural tactics may involve a number of techniques, such as purposefully engaging with others, using technology or even prioritising tasks and domains, in order to negotiate the permeability and the flexibility of the boundary (Allen, Cho and Meier, 2014). In our study, behavioural tactics involved using ICTs to block time, or purposefully disengaging from them

26

to maintain the temporal boundary between work and home. Office based work often involves logging off from and shutting down computers and other equipment, which coupled with the departure from the physical space signals the end of the business day. When working remotely from home, this does not always happen, and remote workers need to purposefully create a distance between them and their equipment to transition back to the home domain. In terms of gender-based differences, men were more likely to use IT tools, such as shared calendars, as a wedge between them and their colleagues, whereas women were more likely to stop using their IT equipment entirely to create distance between them and work.

"Actually I had to start blocking things on my calendar just to, you know, make it very clear to

people that certain times are not good for meetings. So I feel that has helped quite a lot

just clearing the afternoon so that I can do something and then I am only taking very urgent

calls or queries but normal discussions and catch ups it is all during the day." (Sundeep)

"I turn my laptop off and I leave my phone. I just don't, I just don't answer them in the evening."

(Ana)

However, such behavioural tactics to control and maintain temporal boundaries are not always available due to the nature and demands of work:

"And then I am doing some […] work in the evenings, yes. (…) Well, it's supposed to be that

all together I will work 16 [hours] but I usually end up working more, I do. Because the

[…] work takes much more like things I could do on the phone during the day I usually do

in writing at night and send it over. (…) So, I think it's hard to manage the time because

27

in the evening time I am like more tired. And it's usually that I end up like you know going

to bed like midnight." (Trish)

Other tactics we identified reflect *communicative tactics*, which can be described as communicating and managing others' expectations in a way that reduces or avoids boundary intrusion (Park, Liu and Headrick, 2020). In our study, such tactics are employed to set rules and expectations for their family members (boundary keepers) and therefore reinforce boundaries between the two domains:

"It's not the best working conditions so what I have to do at the moment is get my partner and

my daughter to go into the garden and to go into my garden workspace when I see a client

so they're completely out of the house because it's quite a noisy house." (Meghan)

Such tactics were not particularly pronounced in the empirical material, and like in the case of temporal boundaries, we did not observe any gender-based differences.

5. Discussion

There is a wealth of research on the investigation of conflict between work and personal life, as well as several studies focusing on boundary management and the tactics employed by remote workers (Shumate and Fulk, 2004b; Chen, Powell and Greenhaus, 2009; Eddleston and Mulki, 2017). To date, however, less attention has been paid on adopting a gender based perspective. Rather, previous studies have focused on how conflict is experienced differently by the two genders (Gutek, Searle and Klepa, 1991; e.g., Boyar, Maertz and Pearson, 2005;

Zhao *et al.*, 2019) or what the implications might be on, e.g., wellbeing, productivity and performance (Kelliher and Anderson, 2010; Felstead and Henseke, 2017; e.g., Choroszewicz and Kay, 2019). In our study, we focused instead on whether there are any gender-based differences in how remote workers manage boundaries between work and personal life and the tactics they employ. Our thematic analysis of secondary qualitative data of interviews with workers who switched to remote work due to the Covid-19 restrictions shows that there are several differences in how women and men experience and manage the boundaries between family and work. In addition, while the tactics employed to increase or reduce the permeability and the flexibility of the boundaries are similar across the two genders, we notice that there are subtle differences between them.

Remote workers during the pandemic had to continuously transition between roles and cross boundaries, from the work domain to the family domain and vice-versa. Our study has revealed that when work and personal life are collocated, physical, temporal and psychological boundaries are threatened, as they become permeable and more flexible. Largely, this is consistent with the majority of literature that draws from boundary theory (Senarathne Tennakoon, da Silveira and Taras, 2013; McCloskey, 2016; e.g., Choroszewicz and Kay, 2019). However, adopting a gender based perspective enabled us to further identify that while there were implications for both women and men, these were quite different across genders. With respect to physical and temporal boundaries, both genders sought to manage boundary penetration. Yet, we notice that men were more likely to seek and also achieve to reinforce physical and temporal boundaries, thus succeeding in their segmentation strategies. Women on the other hand, often, have been opting for more integrative strategies, temporally fragmenting

their workday and working in shared physical spaces. We consider that this is the case in part due to whether and to what extent, the 'home' is appropriate for remote work (Sahut and Lissillour, 2023).

5.1. Theoretical Contributions

Our findings provide a more nuanced understanding into the experience of remote work. First, earlier studies have argued that segmentation strategies are linked to psychological disengagement from the secondary domain (Kossek and Lautsch, 2012). While our findings do not lend themselves to confirm such a causal link, they do indicate that such segmentation is only possible when both the physical and the temporal boundaries can be negotiated in a way that facilitates segmentation. In addition, we find that while both genders are able to do this to an extent, women are less likely to reinforce the temporal ones, as they more frequently and often purposefully choose to interrupt their workday to attend to chores, family and household needs throughout the day. In other words, the extent to which remote workers are able to proceed with segmentation between the domains of work and personal life, relates to how well they can negotiate both physical and temporal boundaries with boundary keepers.

Second, a recent study has found that indeed there are gendered approaches to how physical and temporal boundaries are managed, focusing however exclusively on dual earner parents (Otonkorpi-Lehtoranta *et al.*, 2022). Our study extends this focus and shows that, irrespective of the particularities of the household (single with/without children, dual earner household with/without children), boundary practices are still gendered and what changes is only which

boundary collapses and who the boundary keepers are (external, such as colleagues, or internal, such as spouses, pets, children).

Our second contribution relates to boundary management strategies and the way these materialise into management tactics. Boundary management strategies are considered as being along the continuum of integration-segmentation, whereby the worker (boundary crosser) seeks to integrate the different domains, keep them separate from each other, or combine tactics and approaches from either strategy. Rothbard (Rothbard, 2001), based on the gender-role socialization perspective, discusses that men are more likely to be segmenters, and thus adopt tactics that help them reinforce the boundaries, whereas women are more likely to be integrators, adopting tactics that blend the domains together. A later study, however, found that such preferences may not be related to gender exclusively, but rather reflect more complex relationships (such as multiple children and their ages) combined with segmentation-supportive organisational policies (Rothbard, Phillips and Dumas, 2005). In our study we found that both women and men express a preference for segmentation strategies, but in reality, and due to conflicts between work and personal life, the two genders are not equally successful in achieving such segmentation. In more detail, women remote workers are susceptible to involuntary permeability of the boundaries due to increased role demands, and possibly the reproduction of role stereotypes, i.e., despite both parents working from home, women are still responsible for childcare and chores, whereby children are more likely to spend the day with the mother rather than the father. As such, women transition between roles more frequently than men, and they therefore adopt tactics that can facilitate this rather than discourage it. With respect to such tactics, the two most frequently adopted pertain to physical and temporal tactics,

31

where remote workers seek to control the spatiotemporal dimension of their workday relatively to their boundary keepers. This finding, within the context of the identified boundary management strategies, illustrates that women are overall more vulnerable along the temporal dimension. Indeed, men participants in the study reported strong tactics to control their time and 'protect' their physical space, whereas women, even when able to work in a separate space within the home, they were still experiencing temporal fragmentation and time shifting, i.e., moving the start time, working later. For men, these tactics led to reduced interruptions in their work, and for women to smoother integration.

In all cases, our findings contribute in understanding the role of technology in facilitating or inhibiting the enactment of boundary management tactics. Irrespective of whether the preferred tactic is that of segmentation or integration, remote workers attempt to manipulate the physical as well as the digital artefacts in their environment. With reference to the physical boundaries, for example, some purposefully choose to lay out their equipment (such as laptops and external screens) in purposefully dedicated rooms (home office) or shared spaces (e.g., kitchen), depending on whether they pursue an integrative or a segmentation tactic, respectively. With reference to the temporal boundaries, we observed many leaning heavily on coordination IT tools, such as shared online calendars, to manage the boundaries between them and their colleagues and employers, many of them further leveraging these for home related activities and synchronisation with their loved ones. Similar findings have been reported by Cousins and Robey (2015) in terms of mobile workers' tactics, and we further extend their work by focusing on remote workers and teasing out the differences between genders. Along these lines, our contribution lies in shedding light in how women and men engage differently with technology

to manage boundaries, whereby women primarily focus on using technology for managing the temporal dimension, whereas men focus primarily on physical boundaries.

This difference further draws attention to the temporal dimension of remote work, and the temporal aspects of boundary management tactics. While women seem more flexible in relation to the temporal boundary and therefore more vulnerable to temporal-based disruptions, men seem more able to or focused in in exercising greater control over the same boundary. In both cases, time and temporality seem as critical considerations. This study therefore on the one hand draws attention to the recent 'temporal turn' in business and organization studies, whereby scholars have been calling for more research into the temporal dimension of remote work (e.g., de Vaujany *et al.*, 2021; Zamani and Spanaki, 2023) while on the other hand further highlights temporal fragmentation as a concept that primarily affects women (Hubers, Dijst and Schwanen, 2018).

5.2. Managerial Implications

Our findings have some important implications for practitioners and especially for HR managers and change managers within businesses and organisations who consider to adopt a remote or hybrid work policy, as well as those considering moving back to an 'on premises' only policy.

Remote work can have both positive and negative effects for employees: on the one hand, working fully remotely can lead to alienation, and low self-confidence for some whereby the employee moves to the periphery of their employers' and co-workers' awareness, leading to an 'out of sight, out of mind' mentality (Sewell and Taskin, 2015); on the other hand, remote work

33

can help employees enhance their wellbeing, achieve work-family balance (Aleem *et al.*, 2023). As such, managers need to consider our findings within the context of the above effects, as well, whereby different remote workers might need access to different tools and systems to manage boundaries in ways that support their performance and productivity. For example, some remote workers may prefer more integrative strategies to accommodate personal and family life; in such cases, enabling flexible working patterns (i.e., workers work towards the contractual hours, but flexibly e.g., 9-2 and 6-9) can be beneficial for workers, as these enable the temporal fragmentation of the workday, and therefore more opportunities to integrate work and family, when compared to fixed work schedule contracts (e.g., 9-5 work patterns). We would consider that such flexible work schedule contracts will benefit both women and men: while in our findings those preferring integrative strategies were primarily women, the benefits of flexible schedule contracts (also known in the UK as flexitime) will be similar for men as well, because in the aggregate such contracts allow workers to manage their work time in ways that are better for them, while still meeting work demands (Chung and van der Horst, 2020). This is particularly important because being able to adapt and accommodate remote workers' needs can significantly enhance performance (both of the employees and of the organisations); however, relevant policies and top management support will still be crucial to achieve this (Chatterjee, Chaudhuri and Vrontis, 2022).

In terms of the role of technology, we acknowledge that it can intensify work and extend the workday, as noted by earlier studies (e.g., Zamani and Spanaki, 2023). However, the mindful use of technology as part of enacting boundary tactics can be beneficial. We observed that several participants use technology in purposeful ways to maintain boundaries between work

and personal time. For example, several use the features of shared calendars to signal availability/unavailability, whereas others consciously change devices to mentally switch between the work and the personal domain, or entirely set aside work laptops and smartphones once the workday is over. We consider that these are useful ways in maintaining the boundaries between the two domains. In addition, and inspired by agile development methodologies, technology can be used to time-box specific tasks. Such an approach would entail blocking off time to protect it from disruptions, but also committing that time to a clearly identified task, thus creating focussed time throughout the workday. This behaviour can be facilitated by the use of software packages, widely available in the mass consumer market, and it has been found that such solutions can improve performance as a result of creating protected focussed time and that it further contributes in prioritising tasks (Das Swain *et al.*, 2023).

6. Conclusions and Future Research

Remote working is often promoted as a solution for achieving a balance between work and personal life, including family, especially among women. However, research over the years has shown that remote work can produce, reproduce and exacerbate conflicts and stereotypes (Sullivan, 2012; Aroles, Granter and Vaujany, 2020; Hafermalz, 2021), thus countering the argument of empowerment and flexibility that often mobilises the discourse around remote work. There are several underlying causes for this. Our study however shows that, when all things are equal, women and men remote workers still are not. Remote workers in general must be able to tailor their boundary management tactics in ways that can support their preferred boundary management strategy (segmentation/integration). This entails having control over the

circumstances that shape and influence work and personal life. In addition, it necessitates support from and good communication with boundary keepers, be it families, friends or colleagues and employers, as this can enable conflict resolution when boundary management tactics clash and boundaries collapse. With respect to women remote workers in particular, remote work can still be a form of employment that addresses the dilemma posed by work/family choices, as our findings suggest that despite the unintended consequences, some of the stress can be alleviated. However, it is equally important that families, organisations and societies at large can learn from the experience during the pandemic to remove the dilemma itself rather than gradually revert to pre-pandemic norms or allow remote work to simply reproduce inequalities.

Like all studies, our study comes with some limitations. First, we used a secondary dataset as the basis of our study. While said dataset is quite rich and specific to remote workers and their experiences regarding conflict during the Covid-19 pandemic, we are limited to the already collected data, what this could tell us, and the contextual conditions as influenced by the pandemic. Further in relation to our empirical material, this was quite homogenous, all being knowledge workers based in the United Kingdom, in or outside a partnership, whereby caring responsibilities were restricted to children in most cases. As a result, our sample is characterised by low diversity. This was purposefully chosen so that we could meaningfully engage and analyse differences in experiences and tactics based on gender, whereby caring responsibilities is a gendered role (Ciccia and Bleijenbergh, 2014). However, it also means that we have not accounted for all possible variance among knowledge remote workers, and thus we can make no claims with regards to the full range of possible configurations in terms of boundary

management tactics (Thorne, 2016). We would welcome large scale studies that examine remote work and boundary management studies, that account for a wider range of personal characteristics, including age, education, sector, particular contractual arrangements (e.g., part time, full time, freelance), as well as families of choice and greater diversity of caring responsibilities (i.e., beyond simply childcare).

Another observation we made was that generally our participants were doing relatively well in maintaining work life balance. This is not unexpected; those who experience significant family-work and work-family conflicts, are more likely to be under more stress and have less time to dedicate in research studies. We would therefore suggest that future studies focusing on boundary management strategies and tactics could focus on gathering and analysing data from extreme cases.

Due to the timing of the study, our findings are necessarily limited by what the Covid-19 lockdown entailed, and therefore cannot be readily generalised. We however believe that our findings can be useful in informing future remote work studies and extend the way we think about remote work. While the pandemic resulted in remote work becoming mainstream, post pandemic, several large organisations had been requiring their work force to return to the office. Yet, there is ample evidence that the situation is difficult to reverse entirely, moving closer to what might be described as hybrid work, i.e., combining work from anywhere with work on premises, which combines the benefits of remote work (e.g., job satisfaction, lower labour costs) with those of on premises work (e.g., socialisation and well-being) (Kessler, 2023). In other words, even though the occurrence of remote work has decreased compared to 2021 and 2022, it is still and will remain quite prevalent, especially among knowledge workers. Therefore, we

consider that our findings can be extended and generalised where the contextual particularities are sufficiently similar to ours (Davison and Martinsons, 2016), as for example, when the objective is to examine gender-based differences in boundary management tactics and experiences when both partners work remotely.

Another limitation is that, while we had access to data collected at four different points in time, we did not conduct a time-based analysis to identify potential changes. This, too, we expect would be a possibly insight point to address in the future, as often being able to transition successfully between roles may require time.

7. References

Aleem, M. *et al.* (2023) 'Remote work and the COVID-19 pandemic: An artificial intelligence-based topic modeling and a future agenda', *Journal of Business Research*, 154, p. 113303. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113303.

Allen, T., Cho, E. and Meier, L. (2014) 'Work–Family Boundary Dynamics', *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, pp. 99–121.

Allen, T.D. *et al.* (2021) 'Boundary Management and Work-Nonwork Balance While Working from Home', *Applied Psychology*, 70(1), pp. 60–84. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12300.

Alon, T. *et al.* (2020) 'The impact of COVID-19 on gender equality'.

Andrade, C. and Lousã, E.P. (2021) 'Telework and Work–Family Conflict during COVID-19 Lockdown in Portugal: The Influence of Job-Related Factors', *Administrative Sciences*, 11(3).

Arntz, M., Ben Yahmed, S. and Berlingieri, F. (2020) 'Working from Home and COVID-19: The Chances and Risks for Gender Gaps', *Intereconomics*, 55(6), pp. 381–386.

Aroles, J., Granter, E. and Vaujany, F.-X. de (2020) '"Becoming mainstream": the professionalisation and corporatisation of digital nomadism', *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 35(1), pp. 114–129. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12158.

Ashforth, B.E., Kreiner, G.E. and Fugate, M. (2000) 'All in a Day's Work: Boundaries and Micro Role Transitions', *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), pp. 472–491.

Barua, A. (2022) *Gender equality, dealt a blow by COVID-19, still has much ground to cover*, *Deloitte Insights*. Available at: https://www2.deloitte.com/uk/en/insights/economy/impact-of-covid-on-women.html (Accessed: 28 December 2022).

Beach, B. (1989) *Integrating Work and Family Life: The Home-Working Family*. SUNY Press.

Boyar, S.L., Maertz, C.P. and Pearson, A.W. (2005) 'The effects of work–family conflict and family–work conflict on nonattendance behaviors', *Journal of Business Research*, 58(7), pp. 919–925. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2003.11.005.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) 'Using thematic analysis in psychology', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp. 77–101. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.

Bulger, C.A., Matthews, R.A. and 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(4), pp. 365–375. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.4.365.

Chatterjee, S., Chaudhuri, R. and Vrontis, D. (2022) 'Does remote work flexibility enhance organization performance? Moderating role of organization policy and top management support', *Journal of Business Research*, 139, pp. 1501–1512.

Chen, Z., Powell, G.N. and Greenhaus, J.H. (2009) 'Work-to-family conflict, positive spillover, and boundary management: A person-environment fit approach', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(1), pp. 82–93.

Choroszewicz, M. and Kay, F. (2019) 'The use of mobile technologies for work-to-family boundary permeability: The case of Finnish and Canadian male lawyers', *Human Relations*, p. 001872671986576. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726719865762.

Chung, H. and van der Horst, M. (2020) 'Flexible Working and Unpaid Overtime in the UK: The Role of Gender, Parental and Occupational Status', *Social Indicators Research*, 151(2), pp. 495–520. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-2028-7.

Ciccia, R. and Bleijenbergh, I. (2014) 'After the Male Breadwinner Model? Childcare Services and the Division of Labor in European Countries', *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 21(1), pp. 50–79. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxu002.

Clark, S.C. (2000) 'Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance', *Human Relations*, 53(6), pp. 747–770.

Çoban, S. (2022) 'Gender and telework: Work and family experiences of teleworking professional, middle-class, married women with children during the Covid-19 pandemic in Turkey', *Gender, Work & Organization*, 29(1), pp. 241–255.

Cousins, K. and Robey, D. (2015) 'Managing work-life boundaries with mobile technologies: An interpretive study of mobile work practices', *Information Technology & People*, 28(1), pp. 34–71. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-08-2013-0155.

Cui, R., Ding, H. and Zhu, F. (2022) 'Gender Inequality in Research Productivity During the COVID-19 Pandemic', *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 24(2), pp. 707–726. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1287/msom.2021.0991.

Das Swain, V. *et al.* (2023) 'Focused Time Saves Nine: Evaluating Computer–Assisted Protected Time for Hybrid Information Work', in *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. *CHI '23: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Hamburg Germany: ACM, pp. 1–18. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581326.

Davison, R.M. and Martinsons, M.G. (2016) 'Context is king! Considering particularism in research design and reporting', *Journal of Information Technology*, 31(3), pp. 241–249. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1057/jit.2015.19.

Delanoeije, J., Verbruggen, M. and Germeys, L. (2019) 'Boundary role transitions: A day-to-day approach to explain the effects of home-based telework on work-to-home conflict and home-to-work conflict: Human Relations'.

Dumas, T.L. and Sanchez-Burks, J. (2015) 'The professional, the personal, and the ideal worker: Pressures and objectives shaping the boundary between life domains', *The Academy of Management Annals*, 9, pp. 803–843.

Eddleston, K.A. and Mulki, J. (2017) 'Toward Understanding Remote Workers' Management of Work–Family Boundaries: The Complexity of Workplace Embeddedness', *Group & Organization Management*, 42(3), pp. 346–387. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601115619548.

Emslie, C. and Hunt, K. (2009) 'Live to Work' or "Work to Live"? A Qualitative Study of Gender and Work–life Balance among Men and Women in Mid-life', *Gender, Work & Organization*, 16(1), pp. 151–172.

Eurofound (2020) *Living, working and COVID-19*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Felstead, A. and Henseke, G. (2017) 'Assessing the growth of remote working and its consequences for effort, well-being and work-life balance', *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 32(3), pp. 195–212.

Flaherty, C. (2020) *Early journal submission data suggest COVID-19 is tanking women's research productivity*, *Inside Higher Ed*. Available at: https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/04/21/early-journal-submission-data-suggest-covid-19-tanking-womens-research-productivity (Accessed: 29 April 2020).

França, T. *et al.* (2023) '"Having a family is the new normal": Parenting in neoliberal academia during the COVID-19 pandemic', *Gender, Work & Organization*, 30(1), pp. 35–51. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12895.

Franken, E. *et al.* (2021) 'Forced flexibility and remote working: opportunities and challenges in the new normal', *Journal of Management & Organization*, 27(6), pp. 1131–1149. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2021.40.

Glaser, B.G. (1978) *Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory*. Mill Valley, CA: The Sociology Press.

Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Co.

Golden, T.D. and Gajendran, R.S. (2019) 'Unpacking the Role of a Telecommuter's Job in Their Performance: Examining Job Complexity, Problem Solving, Interdependence, and Social Support', *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 34(1), pp. 55–69.

Gutek, B.A., Searle, S. and Klepa, L. (1991) 'Rational versus gender role explanations for work-family conflict', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(4), pp. 560–568.

Hafermalz, E. (2021) 'Out of the Panopticon and into Exile: Visibility and control in distributed new culture organizations', *Organization Studies*, 42(5), pp. 697–717. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840620909962.

Hall, D.T. and Richter, J. (1988) 'Balancing Work Life and Home Life: What Can Organizations Do to Help?', *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 2(3), pp. 213–223.

Harker, M.B. and MacDonnell, R. (2012) 'Is telework effective for organizations? A meta-analysis of empirical research on perceptions of telework and organizational outcomes', *Management Research Review*, 35(7), pp. 602–616.

Hennink, M.M., Kaiser, B.N. and Marconi, V.C. (2017) 'Code Saturation Versus Meaning Saturation: How Many Interviews Are Enough?', *Qualitative Health Research*, 27(4), pp. 591–608. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316665344.

Hilbrecht, M. *et al.* (2013) 'Remixing work, family and leisure: Teleworkers' experiences of everyday life', *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 28(2), pp. 130–144.

Holloway, D. (2007) 'Gender, Telework and the Reconfiguration of the Australian Family Home', *Continuum*, 21(1), pp. 33–44. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/10304310601103919.

Hou, J. *et al.* (2022) 'Does Telework Reduce Unequal Impacts of the COVID-19 Disaster on Job Losses Across Genders?' Rochester, NY. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4038594.

Hubers, C., Dijst, M. and Schwanen, T. (2018) 'The fragmented worker? ICTs, coping strategies and gender differences in the temporal and spatial fragmentation of paid labour', *Time & Society*, 27(1), pp. 92–130. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X15609830.

Kashive, N., Sharma, B. and Khanna, V.T. (2021) 'Work from home: understanding boundary management profiles using boundary-fit perspective', *International Journal of Organizational Analysis* [Preprint]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-04-2021-2695.

Kelliher, C. and Anderson, D. (2010) 'Doing more with less? Flexible working practices and the intensification of work', *Human Relations*, 63(1), pp. 83–106. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709349199.

Kessler, S. (2023) 'Getting Rid of Remote Work Will Take More Than a Downturn', *The New York Times*, 7 January. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2023/01/07/business/dealbook/remote-work-downturn.html (Accessed: 9 October 2023).

King, N. (2004) *Using templates in the thematic analysis of text*. Edited by C. Cassell and G. Symon. London: Sage.

Kossek, E.E. and Lautsch, B.A. (2012) 'Work–family boundary management styles in organizations: A cross-level model', *Organizational Psychology Review*, 2, pp. 152–171.

Kreiner, G.E. (2006) 'Consequences of work-home segmentation or integration: A person-environment fit perspective', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(4), pp. 485–507.

Kreiner, G.E., Hollensbe, E.C. and Sheep, M.L. (2009a) 'Balancing borders and bridges: Negotiating the work-home interface via boundary work tactics', *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, pp. 704–730.

Kreiner, G.E., Hollensbe, E.C. and Sheep, M.L. (2009b) 'Balancing borders and bridges: Negotiating the work-home interface via boundary work tactics', *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, pp. 704–730.

Kroumova, M., Mittal, R. and Bienstock, J. (2021) 'Personality meta–traits and time-based work–family conflict: the mediating role of work–home boundaries', *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print). Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-02-2021-2644.

Madsen, S.R. (2003) 'The effects of home-based teleworking on work-family conflict', *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 14(1), pp. 35–58.

Malik, F. *et al.* (2021) 'Digital labour platforms in Pakistan: institutional voids and solidarity networks', *Information Technology & People* [Preprint]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-04-2020-0218.

Marks, A. *et al.* (2021) 'Where Does Work Belong Anymore? The Impact of the COVID19 Pandemic on Working in the UK, 2020-2021'. (data collection]. UK Data Service).

Marston, H. *et al.* (2021) *Beyond Digital: Planning for a Hybrid World. Covid-19 Committee: 1st Report of Session 2019-21*. Other HL 263. London: House of Lords. Covid-19 committee. Available at: https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/5537/documents/56741/default/ (Accessed: 22 July 2022).

McCloskey, D.W. (2016) 'Finding Work-Life Balance in a Digital Age: An Exploratory Study of Boundary Flexibility and Permeability', *Information Resources Management Journal*, 29(3), pp. 53–70.

Melissa, H. *et al.* (2020) *Gender-sensitive social protection: A critical component of the COVID-19 response in low- and middle-income countries*. Intl Food Policy Res Inst.

Michel, J.S. and Clark, M.A. (2013) 'Investigating the Relative Importance of Individual Differences on the Work–Family Interface and the Moderating Role of Boundary Preference for Segmentation', *Stress and Health*, 29(4), pp. 324–336.

Nippert-Eng, C. (1996) 'Calendars and keys: The classification of "home" and "work"', *Sociological Forum*, 11(3), pp. 563–582.

Otonkorpi-Lehtoranta, K. *et al.* (2022) 'Gendering boundary work: Experiences of work–family practices among Finnish working parents during COVID-19 lockdown', *Gender, Work & Organization*, 29(6), pp. 1952–1968. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12773.

Park, Y., Liu, Y. and Headrick, L. (2020) 'When work is wanted after hours: Testing weekly stress of information communication technology demands using boundary theory', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(6), pp. 518–534. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2461.

Paustian-Underdahl, S.C. *et al.* (2016) 'The Work–Family Interface and Promotability: Boundary Integration as a Double-Edged Sword', *Journal of Management*, 42(4), pp. 960–981. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313506464.

Platts, K., Breckon, J. and Marshall, E. (2022) 'Enforced home-working under lockdown and its impact on employee wellbeing: A cross-sectional study', *BMC Public Health*, 22(1), p. 199.

Polyviou, A. and Zamani, E.D. (2023) 'Are we Nearly There Yet? A Desires & Realities Framework for Europe's AI Strategy', *Information Systems Frontiers*, 25(1), pp. 143–159. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-022-10285-2.

Rau B.L. and Hyland M.A.M. (2002) 'ROLE CONFLICT AND FLEXIBLE WORK ARRANGEMENTS: THE EFFECTS ON APPLICANT ATTRACTION', *Personnel Psychology*, 55(1), pp. 111–136.

Rothbard, N.P. (2001) 'Enriching or Depleting? The Dynamics of Engagement in Work and Family Roles', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(4), pp. 655–684. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/3094827.

Rothbard, N.P. and Edwards, J.R. (2003) 'Investment in work and family roles: A test of identity and utilitarian motives'.

Rothbard, N.P., Phillips, K.W. and Dumas, T.L. (2005) 'Managing Multiple Roles: Work-Family Policies and Individuals' Desires for Segmentation', *Organization Science*, 16(3), pp. 243–258.

Sahut, J.M. and Lissillour, R. (2023) 'The adoption of remote work platforms after the Covid-19 lockdown: New approach, new evidence', *Journal of Business Research*, 154, p. 113345. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113345.

Seiz, M. (2021) 'Equality in Confinement: Nonnormative Divisions of Labor in Spanish Dual-Earner Families During the Covid-19 Lockdown', *Feminist Economics*, 27(1–2), pp. 345–361.

Senarathne Tennakoon, K.L.U., da Silveira, G.J.C. and Taras, D.G. (2013) 'Drivers of context-specific ICT use across work and nonwork domains: A boundary theory perspective', *Information and Organization*, 23(2), pp. 107–128. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2013.03.002.

Sewell, G. and Taskin, L. (2015) 'Out of Sight, Out of Mind in a New World of Work? Autonomy, Control, and Spatiotemporal Scaling in Telework', *Organization Studies*, 36(11), pp. 1507–1529. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840615593587.

Shanine, K.K., Eddleston, K.A. and Combs, J.G. (2019) 'Same Boundary Management Preference, Different Outcome: Toward a Gendered Perspective of Boundary Theory Among Entrepreneurs', *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57(1), pp. 185–205. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12424.

Shippen, N.M. (2014) *Decolonizing Time. Work, Leizure, and Freedom*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Shumate, M. and Fulk, J. (2004a) 'Boundaries and Role Conflict When Work and Family are Colocated: A Communication Network and Symbolic Interaction Approach', *Human Relations*, 57(1), pp. 55–74.

Shumate, M. and Fulk, J. (2004b) 'Boundaries and Role Conflict When Work and Family are Colocated: A Communication Network and Symbolic Interaction Approach', *Human Relations*, 57(1), pp. 55–74.

Sullivan, C. (2012) 'Remote Working and Work-Life Balance', in N.P. Reilly, M.J. Sirgy, and C.A. Gorman (eds) *Work and Quality of Life: Ethical Practices in Organizations*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands (International Handbooks of Quality-of-Life), pp. 275–290. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4059-4_15.

Sullivan, C. and Lewis, S. (2001a) 'Home-based Telework, Gender, and the Synchronization of Work and Family: Perspectives of Teleworkers and their Co-residents', *Gender, Work & Organization*, 8(2), pp. 123–145. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0432.00125.

Sullivan, C. and Lewis, S. (2001b) 'Home-based Telework, Gender, and the Synchronization of Work and Family: Perspectives of Teleworkers and their Co-residents', *Gender, Work & Organization*, 8(2), pp. 123–145. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0432.00125.

Thorne, S. (2016) *Interpretive Description, Qualitative Research for Applied Practice*. 2nd edn. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Urquhart, C. (2012) *Grounded Theory for Qualitative Research. A Practical Guide*. UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.

de Vaujany, F.-X. *et al.* (2021) 'Control and Surveillance in Work Practice: Cultivating Paradox in "New" Modes of Organizing', *Organization Studies*, 42(5), pp. 675–695. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406211010988.

Vilhelmson, B. and Thulin, E. (2016) 'Who and where are the flexible workers? Exploring the current diffusion of telework in Sweden', *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 31(1), pp. 77–96. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12060.

Xue, B. and McMunn, A. (2021) 'Gender differences in unpaid care work and psychological distress in the UK Covid-19 lockdown', *PLOS ONE*, 16(3), p. 0247959.

Zamani, E.D. *et al.* (2022) 'Appropriating Information Technology Artefacts through Trial and Error: The Case of the Tablet', *Information Systems Frontiers*, 24(1), pp. 97–119. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-020-10067-8.

Zamani, E.D. and Spanaki, K. (2023) 'Affective temporal experiences and new work modalities: The role of Information and Communication Technologies', *Journal of Business Research*, 154, p. 113311. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113311.

Zhao, K. *et al.* (2019) 'Source attribution matters: Mediation and moderation effects in the relationship between work-to-family conflict and job satisfaction', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(4), pp. 492–505. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2345.